

threatened by this one or two or three people that we're talking about in the State of Nebraska or five or six, were so worried about those few, that we forgot all about the other one and a half million that are out there and this is what really bothers me. Now as far as the thirty year sentence is concerned, I'm not willing to buy into the future generations or future Legislatures to provide the funds to keep these people incarcerated. I was at a meeting in Columbus, Ohio, this fall where they talked about the detention of people, they estimate that it will take about \$26,000 a year to keep a person in maximum security. I'm not ready to bind the people of Nebraska to these dozens or whatever there will be of these people that have committed a serious crime, to keep them incarcerated thirty years at probably from \$20,000 to \$30,000 a year. If there is any problem with our system, it's not in the death penalty, it's in our judicial system and I think we need to work on that. I agree with Senator Chambers. He can look back in the past and see where many injustices were done, but I still think that the death penalty is a deterrent to crime or it would be if it were administered in a manner that we could have some continuity at least. We have people now on Death Row that have been there for I don't know how long waiting for somebody to make a decision so let's make that decision. Then they will know and also our citizens will know, they will know that at least they have some protection. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Simon.

SENATOR SIMON: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I think maybe I should offer an amendment that would solve the whole problem. I think we could probably do away with the Legislature and just set up a tally board and we could let the cards and letters come in on the issues and when 51% from District 31 reaches whatever that figure is then we've solved the issue. That's how I can vote. I don't even have to be here as a matter of fact. I can be home in Omaha working on my other job. We can do that on all the issues. I don't think that is the purpose of why we were elected. I think that as elected public officials certainly we have to keep in mind the views of our constituents. At the same time I think what Senator Fowler has been saying, is that we have an obligation and a responsibility whether or not the issue is a popular one to educate the constituents in our district when we feel strongly, based on the information which we have, may be conflicting to the general knowledge of the public. I would just say then the cards and letters which I have received on LB 64 most of them have used the same sort of criterion comments which have been made by Senator Rasmussen, by Senator Lamb and others. The death penalty is the deterrent. The death penalty by having that, it saves the state money. These are some of the arguments that are used and they are fallacious and they have been proven to be so. We're not taking the time to explain to the people about this. I'm not saying all of them have been convinced and have turned around, but what they are doing they are speaking from an emotional standpoint. They're not speaking based on logic. They're not speaking based on facts or on statistics, but just on a gut reaction. That if I'm going to take a human life because that S.O.B. did so too. Now I would hope that this Legislature and the people in the body would be above that. They would clearly rationalize and use the thought process rather than just taking gut reactions. I think Senator DeCamp, and I wish he were here, because when he was talking to Senator Chambers, one comment Senator DeCamp