

That ought not be the case. You should establish as a policy, if you are going to do something this serious that when certain factors are existing in a situation, regardless of the identity or the race of the perpetrator, regardless of the identity or the race of the victim, whoever commits this offense under certain circumstances is going to run the risk of the penalty. But, when the vast majority of those who commit the crime, designated by statute, don't run the possibility of the punishment, the punishment is not valid. It is a subversion of the law. When people ask constantly what will you do with these first degree murderers if you do away with the death penalty. The same thing that is done with most of them now. They are locked up. They are not put on death row, they are allowed to circulate in the population at the penitentiary and what's more, in less than 18 years they will be back out on the street again. That is what will continue to happen with this difference. If this amendment were adopted, there would be a certitude of a minimum 30 years. That doesn't mean a maximum. What this bill does is say that life would be the sentence, but there is no way that that life sentence could be reduced to anything less than 30 years by operation of the good time law. Such being the case this bill would make a harsher punishment for most murderers than exists now. To those people who say that there would be the same number of appeals in the case of a sentence of life as there is in the death penalty, we can look at the existing situation in Nebraska now and see that is not the case. So the people on the other side who oppose this type of amendment, ignore all of the facts, they don't have to present any evidence, all they need to do is make an emotional appeal. Why the other day I heard Senator Hefner say, that Senator Chambers has brought us no new information. I brought it but he didn't read it. Senator Hefner spoke as though he was very knowledgeable about the death penalty. So if Senator Hefner would answer a question I would like to ask him one or two. Senator Hefner, will you yield to a question or two?

SENATOR LAMB: Senator Hefner.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Was I correct when I tried to quote what you said the other day, namely, that "Senator Chambers has not brought us any new information on this subject." Did I correctly quote you? When I said that?

SENATOR HEFNER: Would you state that question again, Senator Chambers

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, I'm trying to say what you said.