

underlined portion which makes that clear and the opinion expressed that all those sentenced under that provision in California will literally spend their life in prison. This second handout mentions people who supported the bill and one of the most impressive presentations, to me, was when the Rabbi, the Catholic Bishop and the Protestant Minister all sat at the same table to speak in favor of abolition of the death penalty, gave their respective reasons for taking that position, and we also had three individuals who were family members of a murder victim who spoke in favor of abolition. This bill...oh, and in the third page is an article based on information from the Parole Board in Nebraska which demonstrates what most people who study penology are aware of. People who are convicted of and sentenced for first degree murder do not get out and commit additional murders. In Nebraska, you will see from the article that they have been the best parole risks, they have not been paroled and committed additional crimes. So if we could get past some of the mythology and misinformation that has grown up around this issue and see it for what it is, there would be an easier time for the senators to adopt the position of educating the public and placing that vote which, in my opinion, ought to be placed. The state ought not to kill any of its citizens. What LB 327 does is to establish a punishment of life without parole and that punishment would be for those people who, under the present law, would get the death sentence. The way that works, even if the Pardon Board would commute a life without parole sentence to a term of years like 20 to 60, the person who received that commutation would have to serve the entire 60 years. There could be no parole under any circumstances. The other aspects of the bill that had raised some questions dealt with the aggravating and mitigating circumstances. As drafted, LB 327 was designed to remove those conditions that are currently subjects of litigation. Because some of the county attorneys thought the purpose of that change was to open a new area for litigation, the committee adopted an amendment which would return the law to its original condition. Those amendments relative to mitigating and aggravating circumstances would not occur. Since this is a motion to pull the bill from committee, it would come to the floor in the form in which it is introduced without the committee amendment. But I wanted that amendment offered in committee to show my intent to leave the aggravating and mitigating circumstances as they exist right now in the law. Any questions that you have, I'm prepared to answer them. But before getting into the merits of abolishing the death penalty, I would like to remind you that we have pulled