

appear in court, are not informed about the progress or outcome of the case unless they request it. In records kept for one year by Douglas County, when a person who committed an assault was convicted of the sentence, the sentence imposed resulted in concurrent or in other words no further time being served. Those who were being held in pretrial detention received credit for time already served and they served no extra time even if convicted of another offense, an assault. Those who were serving a sentence received a concurrent sentence and ended up serving no extra time. Lancaster County also had this kind of experience. The effect of this type of sentencing is two-fold. First, the correctional officers are demoralized by the fact that they can be assaulted by the prisoners and the one that assaults them receives no penalty, even though they are convicted by the court essentially there is no further time, there is no penalty. And, secondly, the prisoners who commit the assault are led to believe that they can assault whoever they want and they can get away with it. It means no extra skin off their back. They can get away with it and basically that is what has been happening. Now the original LB 465 dealt with city-county problems only and would have served as a deterrent to the inmates with this attitude and would give the correctional officers a better atmosphere in which to work and restore their confidence in the criminal justice system. At the time of the hearing the Judiciary Committee heard from Pat Rackers, Director of the City of Lincoln Corrections, Joe Vitek with Douglas County Corrections and many county correction officers. And they all testified to this fact. In other words, no additional penalty for additional offenses which is a demoralizing result for correctional guards who receive stitches and broken bones. But to my surprise at this hearing there were state correction officers from the state who I had not had any contact with and they appeared before the committee to testify that this was a state correctional problem also. And in the research in looking through the law books we discovered that in 1978 criminal code revision statutes pertaining to assaults on correctional officers as well as statutes dealing with assaulting, threatening, imprisoning or detaining any persons by an inmate for the purpose of compelling or inducing the performance of any act, were repealed. Although the reasons are not known to me, I possibly assume that it was assumed that the assaults could be handled under the general assault and kidnapping statutes. Until the public hearing at which many state correctional officers testified, I, among others, was not aware that these statutes had been repealed. The evidence brought forward in that testimony proved that the assaults behind correctional walls