1	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
2	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
3	In re: House Bill 1382
4	* * * *
5	Stenographic report of hearing held
6	at SCI-Graterford, Graterford, Pennsylvania
7	Friday,
·	December 13, 1991
8	10:00 a.m.
9	HON. THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, CHAIRMAN
10	MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
11	Hon. Jerry Birmelin Hon. Robert D. Reber Hon. James Gerlach
12	11aa Baasaat
13	<u>Also Present</u> :
14	Hon. Andrew Carn, Prime Sponsor of HB 1382 David Krantz, Executive Director
15	Galina Milahov, Research Analyst Paul Dunkelberger, Republican Research Analyst Kathryn Manucci, Committee Staff
16	Sonia Allen, District Office
17	Susan Wright, Republican Staff
	Reported by:
18	Ann-Marie P. Sweeney, Reporter
19	
20	ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY
^4	3606 Horsham Drive
21	Mechanicsburg, PA 17055 717-732-5316
22	
23	
24	
25	ll .

X

03-06-003

INDEX

2		PAGE
3	Hon. Andrew J. Carn, Prime Sponsor, HB 1382	5
4	Donald T. Vaughn, Superintendent, SCI-Graterford	15
5	Tyrone Werts	16
6	Brian Wallace	25
7	Bruce Bainbridge	27
8	Kenneth Tervalon	29
9	Omar Ali	36
10	John Watts, Sr.	72
11	John F. Watts	72
12	John Watts, Jr.	73
13	Patricia Watts	74
14	Sarah Hannigan	76
15	Bill Hannigan	78
16	Agnes Hannigan	84
17	Alice Johnson	93
18	Sue Beard	96
19	Pauline Velasquez	101
20	Hugh Colihan, Assistant District Attorney, Philadelphia	103
21	Lois Williamson	118
22		120
23	Anthony Jacobs	120
24	Stephen Blackburn	136
25	Fletcher Long	130

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: If I could have your attention, we're going to open this House Judiciary Committee hearing at Graterford. It's concerning House Bill 1382. Prime sponsor Andy Carn is with us and will be the first testifant.

I would just like to introduce myself for the record and for the public that's here. I am Chairman Tom Caltagirone, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. I come from the 127th Legislative District, Reading, Berks County.

I want to thank the Superintendent and the staff and the corrections officers and the public for being so cordial and patient in waiting. We had a few delays. And this is the first in a series of hearings that we're having on this legislation. We do plan to hold one Tuesday in Western State Penn, and there's also another one that's being scheduled for Muncy. So this is the first of three public hearings that we are having concerning this legislation.

And I want to say that we have striven to find the results of the work that we do in Harrisburg by touring yesterday we were just up at the Youth Detention Facility in Loysville, Perry County, and we have been to almost every prison that the State operates over this last year, and over the last two

1 years we have been in many of the county prisons and 2 many of the youth detention facilities. I think it's extremely important for those of us that help to write 3 the laws to see the effects and results of the laws 4 5 that we write in Harrisburg, and part of that has been 6 to bring the committee out into the field to visit the 7 institutions, to visit some of the results of the 8 legislation that either we've been directly involved in 9 or we'll be taking a look at reforming in some way. 10 For the record, I would like the members 11 and staff that are present to introduce themselves, and 12 if we could start at my left and just go right across, 13

if we could start at my left and just go right across, I would appreciate it. And if the members would like to make any comments as we come across, please feel free.

MR. DUNKELBERGER: Paul Dunkelberger, Republican staff.

MS. WRIGHT: Susan Wright, Republican staff.

MS. MANUCCI: Kathryn Manucci, Democratic staff.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: Representative Birmelin from Wayne, Pike and Susquehanna Counties.

REPRESENTATIVE REBER: Representative
Reber, Minority Chairman of the Subcommittee on Courts

of this committee from Montgomery County, immediately west of the institution.

MS. ALLEN: Sonia Allen from the district staff.

MS. MILAHOV: Galina Milahov from the Democratic staff.

MR. KRANTZ: David Krantz, Executive Director, House Judiciary Committee.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: And with that, I'd like to start off with our first testifant, who also happens to be the prime sponsor of this legislation, Andy Carn from Philadelphia.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to thank you and the other members from the House Judiciary Committee that are here today for taking this time. I would like to also thank Commissioner Lehman and Superintendent Vaughn for the opportunity to use this facility for having this public hearing on this issue.

I have for three sessions now introduced this bill or some semblance of it for the purpose of trying to bring a little more justice from our perspective into the issue of life sentencing in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I was very surprised myself after becoming a legislator to find out that in

Pennsylvania when someone receives a life sentence it is until they die. I wasn't aware of that myself. I always thought, before becoming a legislator, that there was some way that lifers had the opportunity to be paroled or to have an opportunity for consideration to be released. I thought that because of other State laws that I have seen enacted and being implemented.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And what concerns me more than anything else about the need for reform in this regard is that I personally have seen many persons being dealt injustice in our system, and not to say that our system is perfect or should be perfect. I know it's not perfect. And that's why I've taken this kind of initiative. Many of my fellow colleagues question my reasons for taking such a position when politically they don't think that it's a popular issue. And I can agree that in our society today that prison issues are not popular issues. As a matter of fact, we live in a society that has, and even in our own legislature has increased penalties, has increased mandatory sentencing, and as a result has increased the populations in our prisons. And as a result, we as legislators are faced annually with a budget problem as a result of this. We just allocated dollars to build more prisons. What concerns me is where are we going to get the money from to even

operate these prisons, as I look at the budget problems that we face with every year and the struggles that we go through trying to pass these budgets.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So there are many levels of concerns that I see that brings me to the need to introduce such legislation for us to consider. Not as an emotional issue, but as an issue of practicality, as an issue of justice, as an issue of fairness, as an issue of what is right. We are paying tremendous amounts of money to keep people incarcerated that can, in fact, be productive citizens, that can, in fact, produce incomes and pay taxes themselves if given the opportunity, at no threat to society. And that's really what the question in my mind becomes. Should we be paying for incarceration of persons who have proven not to be a threat to society? As I look at our State budgets, I say we really cannot afford to continue to do this. But again, emotionally and politically, we live in a society that has promoted the concept of lock 'em up and throw away the key, and as a result, in America we have more people locked up per capita than any other country in the world, and that's something that we as Americans need to think about, we as Pennsylvanians need to think about, because under the trend that is presently put forth, our population of incarcerating

persons will increase in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and that concerns me.

One of the things that I always looked at when I became a legislator is what we called our system: The Department of Corrections. The Department of Corrections. Somehow those legislators before us felt that the system of incarceration was for the purpose of corrections. I'm assuming that's what they assumed the responsibility was to correct, and I'm assuming that's because they did not want to lock people up and provide for them without any recourse of these persons getting a chance to rehabilitate themselves and become productive citizens.

Now, the lifers' situation, which House Bill 1382 attempts to address, is my version of saying to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, saying to the people and saying to my colleagues, let us look at whether or not we can come up with a way in the system to determine whether someone is a threat to society or not that is a lifer and whether or not we can safely find a way to release some of them so that they can become working citizens and tax paying citizens.

That's really my objective. And I don't want to take anything away from the crime itself. There's no doubt in my mind that some of the crimes that have been

committed are ghastly and need to be punished. I'm for punishment. I think people need to be punished. But I also realize that they need to be rehabilitated. The Department of Corrections, I understand from my own observations that there's not very much corrections going on, and one of the reasons is because of overcrowding. We're in the warehousing business. mean, let us be honest with ourselves. We are in the warehousing business. And I noticed that because I'm a frequent visitor of Graterford in particular and other institutions, and I have seen that. I at one time taught GED in Graterford years ago, so I understand the reality that we're faced with.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So as a legislator, I have to take this initiative because again, only but by the grace of God go I, and I felt committed that me knowing what I know and seeing what I see, that I have to take this effort to try to assist not only those who are subjected to our laws but to assist all of Pennsylvanians in our problem with budgetary restraints that we are faced with. I don't know what the future holds for our State budget problem, but I know that there's no way in the world as a legislator that I can see us continually building and operating prisons without creating more taxes in order to afford it. And I'm against that. I

mean, all we talk, anti-tax, sure I'm anti-tax just like anyone else, but we have a situation where we as legislators must look logically at the systems and find out ways in which we can affect cost reductions and changes possibly in the policies that affect our criminal justice system.

I have taken the personal observation of looking at different cases of inmates who have been sentenced to life. There is so much discrepancy situation in the sentencing process, as well the results of different individuals in their trials. For instance, you're going to hear from all Steve Blackburn who has just been commuted, and when I read the facts of his case and realize that he was not the triggerman but the triggerman has long been on the street, you know, it raises a question of fairness in my mind as to how fair the system really is. So we are trying to address some of those fairness questions.

House Bill 1382 tries to lay out a plan. It's a plan that takes a minimum 15, 20 years or more for anyone to be able to complete. Again, punishment is necessary, but rehabilitation is also necessary. I don't know if we are ready to start rehabilitation as a correctional facility or as a criminal justice system in Pennsylvania because of our overcrowdedness, but I

have also determined some costs that have ranged from the area of \$15,000 to \$29,000 a year that we're paying to incarcerate individuals. I'm tired of paying for My constituents complain to me about spending -why the State is spending so much money to incarcerate people. I get questions like that. You know, why are we spending \$25,000 to incarcerate someone when they see that, well, if someone had a job making \$25,000 they could in fact take care of themselves and their families, because many of these same persons that are incarcerated who are no threat to society have children out there who we are also supporting through our I have documented those kinds of welfare system. statistics that are coming right out of our State budget. So it gets beyond the costs of incarceration. We're then also forced to take care of children of these individuals and their families. So I have documented about seven or eight cases where we are spending in excess of \$70,000 for a family. A lifer, his family on welfare, and the costs related to that. It's costing us as taxpayers \$70,000 a year. Now, that bothers me. Again, because I went through that whole budgetary process and I'm saying, when are we going to look at this? When are we going to take this out of an emotional view and look at the practicality of it? And

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the reality and statistics reflect that lifers who have been commuted across this country have a lower recidivism rate than other inmates who have been released. That's a fact. We can see that. Again, we can talk about why that is, but again, it's still a fact.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So again, in Pennsylvania, I'm trying to take the politics out of the issue of lifers. trying to make it a decision based on facts and not a position based on politics. Statistics show that governors of Pennsylvania commuted more persons in their second term once we created a law that limited the terms of governors, they commuted more lifers in their second term than in their first term. was a political decision. Purely a political decision understandably a political decision. You know, no Governor wants to be faced with running in a second term with opposition saying that he released lifers. You know, that whole Willie Horton concept that was used in the presidential campaign really raises these emotions in people's minds and their hearts that cause us as politicians not to do what is logically correct but to do what is emotionally and politically feasible.

So I'm trying to get us away from that kind of decision when it comes to making a decision

about whether someone should be placed on parole who has been given a life sentence. Let the facts of each individual case be the determining factor. Let it not be a political decision by a governor. And that's really all I'm trying to do. Right now we have a commutation process. Governor Casey, like I say, I'm watching him. He's commuted more in his second term and he's doing it based on the facts. But those facts were there before he ran for his second term, but now he's using those facts as the basis for making his commutation decision. I'm saying, let's eliminate that political decision. Let's put it in the hands of persons who are professional at the business of re-evaluating inmates and making decisions based on facts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So that's the objective of House Bill 1382, to take the politics out of the decision, to come up with a feasible way that persons can be logically considered, and let's take the tax burden off the people and keep the emotions out of this decision.

And I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to have these remarks. This is an uphill struggle. I know that it is. This is my third section introducing this bill. This is the first time I've been given a public hearing and I am thankful for

14 1 I know it's a struggle and I've said to the 2 supporters of the lifers that we have an uphill battle. 3 I'm committed to this as long as I'm a member of the 4 legislature, and in some way hopefully members of the 5 Judiciary Committee can see fit to make some 6 considerations, if not of the bill itself but of the 7 concept that the bill is promoting, and I want to thank 8 you very much. 9 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, 10 Representative Carn. 11 Representative Birmelin. 12 BY REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: (Of Rep. Carn) 13 Representative Carn, I think I picked up Q. 14 somewhere in your earlier testimony about where your 15 bill could be enforced in law that a prisoner would 16 still be in prison for 18 or more years? 17 A. Fifteen or more. 1.8 And then he would qualify through the Q.

- Q. And then he would qualify through the provisions that you would have?
- A. Under this bill, if this bill was law, it would take a minimum of 15 years for a person to complete the program.
 - Q. Fifteen?

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. Minimum of 15.
- Q. From beginning of the sentence?

1

A. Yes.

2

3

But there are provisions for those who A.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay, thank you. That's the only Q. question I have.

have already been incarcerated and would shorten that time period because they have already been in for a while.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Representative Carn.

> REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We would next like to hear from Donald T. Vaughn, Graterford Superintendent, and a very gracious host.

I'm not going to SUPERINTENDENT VAUGHN: sit down. I just wanted to take this opportunity to welcome everyone to the community here at Graterford. I see a lot of familiar faces in the audience, and we're here for a good purpose today. Graterford is part of the community, and we must always remember that. And when the Honorable Caltagirone visited the lifers here at the institution and we talked about the public hearings, I couldn't think of a better place to have the hearings than right here at Graterford where we house most of the lifers that are in the State of Pennsylvania.

So I just wanted to welcome you to Graterford, and remember that this is part of your community, and the people that live here came from your community.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, endent.

And I do want to mention that it was at the suggestion of the Superintendent to afford us the courtesy to be here today and it really worked out fine. I want to thank him again.

The next testifants who will be testifying will be Tony Tyrone Werts, Brian Wallace, Bruce Bainbridge, Kenneth Tervalon, and Omar Ali.

If you would like to please come forward and you can be seated right here, and we can start off with Tyrone first and we'll take them in the order that they are on the sheet then.

MR. WERTS: I have a statement here I would like to read.

First of all, I would like to express our deep appreciation for this opportunity to be heard. We would also like to thank Andrew Carn for his diligent support and his courageous effort in trying to educate

the public and the legislature on this issue. I would further like to thank the Department of Corrections and Donald T. Vaughn and his staff for permitting the hearings to be held here.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Tyrone Werts.

I'm 41 years old, and I've been in prison for 16 1/2

years for a conviction of second-degree homicide as a

result of my participation in a robbery where someone

was unintentionally killed. Before coming to prison, I

lived at 8645 Forrest Avenue in Philadelphia; was

married, and the father of one child. At present, I

have the fortune, or misfortune, based on how you look

at it, of being president of the largest inmate

organization in the State, Lifers Incorporated, a group

comprised of 550 life term prisoners here at

Graterford.

Our organization was formed in 1981 for purposes of securing, through legislative action, meaningful change in the laws of our life term prison sentences to become eligible for parole review on a case-by-case basis. Over the years, our goals and objectives have grown to include extensive community service projects which foster community responsibility and civic pride for incarcerated people. This has led to development of broad-based programs to solve

problems in both internal and external communities.

I sit here today as a representative of the 2,200 life sentence prisoners in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania who are not eligible for parole nor allowed to participate in a number of pre-release programs. Contrary to common opinion by lawyers, judges, prosecutors, the general public and the media, lifers are not released after 10 or even 15 years. In Pennsylvania, life means just that - life; a concept that is outside the mainstream of correctional thought in the United States.

It is our position that legislation must be adopted to change the law as it applies to the release of life term prisoners. This legislation must establish a case-by-case review where each lifer will be considered for parole review with the judgment based on a rigid criteria of case history, psychological profiles, personal development, and behavior/attitudinal adjustment.

In 1972, there were only 400 life term prisoners in Pennsylvania. However, in 1974 a change in the penal code established two categories of murder which now carry mandatory life sentences - first and second degree. Prior to 1974, the only person to be convicted of first degree murder was sentenced to life

without parole. As a result of the change in the law, the number of lifers in the State of Pennsylvania has increased at an alarming rate, exceeding 2,200 to date. With the average of 100 new lifers coming through the system each year, there will be well over 3,200 by the year 2000. With no lifers being released, the cost of maintaining this population will continue to grow. At \$20,000 per year per lifer, by the end of the century, the costs will soar to over \$64 million just for this population, without taking inflation and geriatric care into consideration. Factor in the 50-year life span per lifer, and the cost boggles the mind, not to mention the wallet.

This tax burden on Pennsylvania citizens seems unnecessary, when in actuality a very small percent of life term prisoners have crimes that fall into the category of sensational. Many lifers were first offenders, many were involved in crimes of domestic violence, crimes that were committed in a moment of passion and whose histories were heretofore free of criminal violence. Add to this number the many lifers who were not the actual perpetrators of the crime, or who played minor roles as knowing or unknowing accomplices, and you have a large population of life term prisoners whose consideration for

conditional release at some point in their incarceration is not only consistent with correctional standards but also practical for the management of the prison system. But with 2,200 life term prisoners in the State of Pennsylvania, the Commonwealth has in effect a permanent prison population without the hope or possibility of parole. Not only is this situation inconsistent with the theory of corrections, but it also presents a control problem for correctional staff since the system that maintains life term inmates is deprived of the incentive element for behavior control.

The Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act, House Bill 1382, when made law will not release lifers back into society en masse. It should not be confused with the establishment of a minimum sentence for life term prisoners by which lifers would automatically be released after serving a definite number of years.

What this bill will do is:

To allow an existing classification process within the Department of Corrections to be used to determine the suitability and acceptability of life term prisoners for parole review on a case-by-case basis.

Make the time served on a life sentence dependent upon the circumstances of the individual

subject lifer with regard to public risk, behavior adjustment, socialization, and the ability to thrive psychologically and economically in the free society.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Add consistency and objectivity to the process of releasing life term prisoners on parole.

Under the context of House Bill 1382, every life term prisoner will not qualify for parole consideration. It is not formulated with the intent of releasing every lifer confined in the prisons of Pennsylvania. Such a proposal would be absurd and ludicrous and dangerous to the general welfare of the Commonwealth. In essence, what it does accomplish is an objective and standardized method of parole review consideration for those lifers who would otherwise be excellent candidates for Executive Clemency. Furthermore, it would give the Department of Corrections the leverage to include life term prisoners within the parameters of its treatment process with educational, occupational, and social rehabilitation. This aspect has been lacking in the Pennsylvania corrections system as the lifer population has been neglected as a class for such institutional programming. This is primarily due to the fact that the Department of Corrections has not had a policy or strategy or a specific goal objective in dealing with

its life term inmates.

Parole review on a case-by-case basis will serve to bring Pennsylvania in line with the overwhelming majority of States in the United States by providing a form of conditional release for life term prisoners. This is the goal of House Bill 1382, to bring case review into reality for the men and women serving life terms in this Commonwealth, with the determination based on the criteria of social, educational and personal development. The Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act, House Bill 1382, will incorporate these concepts.

We would like to make it plain that support for case-by-case review and the needs of victims are not mutually exclusive. As a matter of fact, House Bill 1382 includes provisions that allow the family of victims to be heard and play a role in determining whether or not a lifer is released. In addition, this legislation will require the lifer, if paroled, to pay into the Victim's Compensation Fund for five years, a situation which is not required by any other parolee.

As human beings, we are sensitive to the needs of victims. Since most of us come from the inner city where our own families are victimized by crime, we

can imagine the pain and anguish that victims feel, that we are sorry and deeply regretful for our actions. The majority of lifers who in one day, or in one fleeting moment, through blind rage, uncontrollable passion, accident or fear performed an irrevocable act that he or she is genuinely sorry for. We have been living with our grief, sorrow and punishment, and many of us will carry the weight of our remorse for the rest of our lives. Many of us have contemplated life and death over several decades and no one knows more about the preciousness of life than those of us who have taken it and are truly repentant.

While there is a provision to pay into the compensation fund, we fully understand that there is no medium of exchange, no weight in gold that can serve as just compensation for the life of another human being. We want families of victims, the legislature, and the citizens of Pennsylvania to know with certitude, and understand clearly that the concepts and development stages that advances one towards parole review is not derived from any false idea that this will make all things smooth, level, or square. It is an expression of our faith derived from our remorse, the sincerity of our repentance for our actions, and compassion in our hearts for both the

victim and their survivors.

We understand that crime continues to be a problem in our communities, and the public has a right to demand safe streets. Support for this comprehensive bill will not make one soft on crime. Those individuals who commit crimes against society must in some way pay for their actions. However, we can no longer continue to overburden the system, drain vital resources when many men and women can be released back into society as law-abiding, taxpaying and productive citizens again, without increasing risk to the public.

In conclusion, we would like to thank you for giving us this opportunity to educate you and the public concerning this issue. Your attention and consideration in this matter is a courageous and noble step toward addressing one problem associated with our criminal justice system. We hope that we are able to shed some light on this subject. Lifers across the State, as well as their families and supporters have worked hard for this opportunity to be heard and are watching and hoping with eager anticipation. We pray that the wisdom of this legislative body will recognize the need for reform on this particular issue.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

If we could hear from Brian next, what I would like to do is have everybody present their testimony and then I'll open it the up for the panel for questions.

MR. WALLACE: First of all, I would like to say good morning to the members of the Judiciary Committee, distinguished guests. I would like to thank you all for being here today. Thank you for making it possible for me to be here today to speak at this hearing. I have some copies. I would like to pass them out.

My name is Brian Wallace. My age is 34. At the time of my arrest I was 14. My charge was robbery/murder. Date I was convicted was July 7, 1972.

Brief outline of my case, as you noticed, on August 10, 1971, I and two co-defendants entered the business of Mr. Guido Zanni, a variety store owner, located at the intersection of 15th and Wharton Streets. We entered with the intent of only to rob Mr. Zanni. Unfortunately, upon leaving Mr. Zanni fired one shot, and as a result of his firing one shot we panicked and one shot was fired back. Mr. Zanni was unfortunately hit, resulting in the loss of his life.

After being arrested on August 13, 1971, only days after being detained at the Youth Study

Center, I attended a preliminary hearing at 1801 Vine Street. Since only a juvenile at the time, and soon to be 15 years old, February 8, 1972, it was recommended that I be certified as an adult, and a hearing was held February 10, 1972. And so were my co-defendants. We were charged with robbery, conspiracy, murder, and violations of the Firearms Act. I was found guilty of all charges. One of my co-defendants was found not guilty, the other co-defendant was sentenced to an indefinite sentence, 18 months to 3 years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Since then I have been incarcerated at 19 I have involved myself in a number of years now. academic programs, schooling. As you noticed down at the bottom, some academic achievements I've participated in since being here at this institution and Camp Hill. My current activities within the institution is down at the bottom - Al Kafarrah Drug Substance Abuse Program, which keeps me from the ills of drugs. I've been blessed fortunately not to be involved with drugs and I've been free from it, but this keeps me mindful of the use of drugs since a lot of friends that I do know and have known over the years I've seen the results of what drugs can do to you. And the NAACP program, the Jaycee's organization, Communications Group that Dr. Lance Cook here, chief

psychologist here. I'm continuing to further my education in academic and business education with Mr. Wallace Lab.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Bruce.

MR. BAINBRIDGE: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Bruce Bainbridge, and I'm glad to have this opportunity to stand before you and speak with you on the lifers' plight.

As I said, my name is Bruce Bainbridge.

I am currently age 37. At the time of my arrest I was

24. I was arrested and charged with criminal homicide,
general criminal homicide, and convicted on January 10,

1980. I had a jury trial and I was convicted of first
degree. The county in which I come from is Schuylkill.

A brief outline of my case is that on July 16, 1979, I, with a few others, were out partying. Later on that day, someone in my car, while at a convenience store, got in an argument with my alleged intended victim, one David Dunsavage. Somehow I was pulled into the argument, for which I broke it up and continued on to party the rest of that night.

I ended up in Pottsville earlier that evening where we came upon the intended victim again in a high speed chase between two vehicles. I was driving and shooting a .22 caliber pistol while on Route 61 at

the car in front of me. Upon re-entering the Pottsville city limits, there was a final shot from my gun for which a ricocheted bullet had hit a bystander, one John Grivnovics. He was standing at a sidewalk near a bus terminal. The man died a short time later, as a direct result of that gunshot wound.

On January 10, I was convicted of first degree murder and related charges. June 23, 1982, I was sentenced to life in prison at Graterford.

To date, I have been incarcerated almost 12 years. January 10 it will be 12 years. My academic achievements while here, I acquired my GED. Vocational training called for electronics, and I was certified in electronics, and air conditioning and refrigeration. I currently, while I have been stockpiling college credits, I have 42 credits toward an associate degree in business management from Montgomery County Community College, and am currently enrolled in Villanova's Bachelor's program here at the prison, for which I have 54 credits toward that.

Currently, my activities within the prison are that internal coordinator for the Family Resource Center. We deal with the children of the incarcerated to maintain the family unit as much as possible during their stay here. Coordinator of a

Reading is Fundamental Project, which also is currently involved with the Family Resource Center. That deals with providing books to the youngsters that come here. The unfortunate youngsters that come here. I'm kind of high on the literacy rate, and this is one way of stemming the tide there.

I'm also a coordinator of the Great Books
Discussion Program, which functions here on a monthly
basis between a group of inmates and community
volunteers that come in together and talk about
reading. An active member of the Holy Name Society
here. Treasurer of the Educational Council here.

My prison job is I'm a clerk for correctional industries, and I'm currently involved with the Victim Offender Recollection Project.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you, Bruce. Kenneth.

MR. TERVALON: My name is Kenneth Tervalon, and I want to thank the members of the committee for giving me this opportunity to speak.

I am going to read what I wrote here and then I'll tell you a little bit about myself.

Honorable members of the House Judiciary Committee, thank you for allowing me to speak with you

today concerning House Bill number 1382. The two topics which I wish to bring to your attention are:
The usefulness of House Bill 1328 as a management tool of the Department of Corrections and the point of view of the client, and the conditional release aspect of the proposed bill as a management tool.

All inmates are reviewed annually to determine what their program participation has been and needs to be. This review lets the inmate know what he has not done and what he needs to do in order to meet the programming needs which the Department of Corrections sees that the inmate needs. The reasons for participation in programming can be many, depending on the individual. One of the reasons that surely to insure that the inmate will be acceptable for parole when a parole review occurs. In the case of the inmate sentenced to life in prison, the programming review must surely be intended to be used for parole review at some time.

The goal of program participation for the inmate in most cases is to be an appropriate candidate for parole review. For those inmates without the opportunity for parole review, what then is the goal of program participation? The point that I am trying to make, gentlemen and ladies, is that there exists a tool

to encourage program participation by all clients in the system. However, the tool is only applicable to all clients in the system as this bill becomes law. Indeed, in the past few months there have been four persons who were life sentenced inmates one day who were not life sentenced inmates on the next day. The sentence status of two of these inmates was changed by the courts, and the other two were changed through the commutation process. In these cases, the goal of the management tool, namely parole review, was met for individuals on one day when they were not eligible for that same review the day before.

What had happened? Were they different men in the sense that they were not the same persons who had been sentenced to life in prison? Obviously not. They were, each one, the same human being. However, their status had been changed and parole review became possible. Passage of this bill would, for a few, make possible a status change and parole review.

Conditional release. This bill does not let inmates go carte blanche. Currently, prior to their conditional release, all other inmates convicted of all other crime category offenses are reviewed by the Department of Corrections and the Board of

Probation and Parole. Not all of those inmates reviewed are granted conditional release. In the same manner then, those inmates currently not eligible for conditional release in certain crime categories would become eligible for conditional release as this bill becomes law. That is not to say that all inmates eligible for conditional release will be released. Rather, it is to say that the privilege of conditional release will be able to be earned by all clients in all crime categories. Conditional release provides a means for the client to re-enter society gradually, under the supervision of the Department of Corrections and the Board of Probation and Parole through the mechanisms already in place and already used to assist in the re-entry of all other persons who are released from prison.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Conditional release is one of the goals that the long-term inmate reaches for as a means of displaying himself or herself as an appropriate client for consideration for parole review.

My name is Kenneth Tervalon. I'm serving a life sentence for first degree murder. I became involved in this crime by going to a meeting with some people who purported themselves to be black activists in the late '60's. They were an urban militant group.

They planned a robbery. As a result of the robbery, two of the participants kept some of the funds. The group met, decided to kill those two men. Those two men were killed. I am the man who left my apartment and lured one of the men out of his house so that he could be killed by the other members of the conspiracy. I have deeply regretted that act for 20-some years, and I regret it every day. It's not something I'm proud to say. I hope that one day I will be able to do something for the gentleman's family, and that I will be able to pay my debt to society in a very realistic way. This bill will give me the opportunity to do that.

In the meantime, while I've been in jail,
I have earned an M.A. in social psychology. I'm
currently working in the carpenter's shop here. In May
I'll have 4,000 hours in as an apprentice. I worked
for the correctional industries here on the dairy for
seven years, which gave me an 8,000 hour certificate
for learning that job. And I am currently in the
Pennsylvania Business Institute School here earning a
degree in accounting management.

I worked with a number of programs in the prison. The Jaycees, the Holy Name Society. The Knights of Henry Kristoff, the Lifers Incorporated, and

I'm currently working with a group called the Youth Project. We work with children from Wordsworth Academy. They come here and we talk to them about the choices that they have available to them at this time in their lives.

There's not too much that a man in prison can do that reaches out to the community. We have to work within the community here, within the walls, to display to each other and to society our remorse and to make some contribution to society. It's not easy, but then nothing is easy when you get right down to it. But we try our best. We try our best. And if we can keep one kid from coming to jail, then we're doing a good job. We're doing a good job.

I want to say something else, and this is a little off the cuff. It recently became possible for me to get out of jail. I have a sentencing judge who said that he wants to help me get out of jail, and for 20 years I had said, well, one day I'm going to get out. I'm going to get out one day. But there was no real mechanism for me to get out, other than commutation. So I was working a fantasy. But when this gentleman told me that he really wanted to help me get out of jail, the fantasy became a reality, and in that moment my outlook on everything I did changed.

The way I behaved towards the officers, towards my family, towards work, everything I did took on a different point of view because release becomes a reality. When release becomes a reality for men, they change. Those four men I spoke about, when it's time for them to go, they are not the same guys we've known for 15 or 20 years. They don't want to play games. They want to get serious. They've got to live when they get out. They've got to worry about am I going to have a skill to get a job? What am I going to do about where I'm going to live? It gets real serious when you know that there's a date. Okay. And I tend to think that it gets easier for the staff, because they don't have to make up a stick and a carrot. It's there.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think that this bill will provide the Department of Corrections with the management tool that they need, and I don't say that to cow-tow you to them. When I first came here I wasn't a good guy, okay, and God is not finished with me yet, but these people changed me. They did their job. And I have to give them credit for that. They changed me. And I think that with this tool they can change other people, and that will be a benefit not only to individuals like myself but to society as a whole, and that's why I'm going to ask you to please support this bill, please

support this bill. Because it means a lot to you as well as to the men here and to their families, and I want to thank the honorable members of the House Judiciary Committee for allowing me to speak with you today concerning House Bill 1382.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.
Omar.

MR. ALI: Yes. My name is Edwick
Systrom, when I was brought to prison, that's my birth
name. Since being incarcerated, my name was changed
because of religious preference. Omar Eski Ali is the
name that I go by. I've been in prison -- January
1992, the 7th of January I will be incarcerated 21
years in the State prison system. Before coming to
prison I am the father of nine children, I owned my own
home and I was in business before I came to prison.
I'm presently in court in the Federal court and I
should be going to court shortly. I'm a lifer at this
time.

Like Kenny was had just stated, I feel different because a law had just been passed called the systematic excluding black people from the jury system and I was a victim who was tried twice by an all-white jury and this is one of my reasons why I'm in prison at this particular time and I'm before the courts to prove

my innocence. Cases of people who have a life sentence, they vary. And oftentimes people don't understand that a person could be in a car with three other people, someone could go into a store or whatever the establishment is and commit a crime, the person that's driving may not even know what had transpired in the establishment or where the robbery would have occurred, but if all those people were apprehended, each one of them would get a life sentence. I think with the perception of people of a person in prison for a life sentence was that that person actually was the shooter, but all three people or four people could become one who can wind up with a life sentence in the State of Pennsylvania as we.

As we know, in 46 States of the United States they have a mechanism for parole eligibility on a case-by-case basis, and this is the thing that we want to point out to people that we are not talking about a floodgate, we are talking about one's own merit, individual's own merit. I've been in prison, as I've stated earlier, 21 years in next year, 1992. I presently, like Mr. Tervalon, develop a society known as the OSU, the Outside Service Unit. This has afforded people who have jumped through a number of hoops that qualified them, their attitude and their

progress while in prison. As a lifer, to get that opportunity to live outside of the prison walls, it's an unbelievable experience and a relief that to be a lifer you would have to understand it. We have certain freedoms and liberties who are not afforded to people behind a prison wall. I lived out there almost two years out in the OSU area. But to -- the point that I really want to make here is that you have lifers, you have 33 lifers that live outside of the prison wall. You have a man, two people who live, that I know particularly that I wanted to bring their names and have it read into the record. One name is Withers Ponton. He's lived in the OSU area for 12 years. He's been in prison for 25 years. You have another person named Thomas, and we refer to him affectionately as "Pop" Burns. He's 66 years old, and he's lived in the OSU area for 12 years. He was 35 when he came to prison, he has 33 years in prison. He's an elderly man and it may become a time where this particular individual you would like to see for yourself, he's an elderly man, he can just barely get around. And when youngsters come through the prison system and see this sort of thing and see people of this caliber who have accomplished a number of things, they wonder why they should go through the school system and acquire a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

certain awards and things of that nature if we are still here. We were selected to come here and represent the population here at Graterford Prison. We are considered, pardon me I'm losing my voice because I have a cold, we are considered as representatives of the population here at the Graterford Prison.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, if we do represent as defined to be as the best of what we have here, what hope or what example is set for the rest of the guys who are just coming into the system? And I don't want to get away from the point that we have forgotten the victims of crime. This is one of the things that has a tendency to get side stepped, your discussing the parole eligibility. You hear what we have accomplished since we have been in prison and that sort of thing. could go and be an asset to society and we have proof like Jake Anderson sitting back here and Steve Blackburn, but I'm saying that the point that I'm trying to make is that while we are here in prison, we have tried to extend ourselves to the outer community in any fashion that we have that we can. There are people probably here today who are victims of crime, and when they see us sitting here speaking of what we have accomplished and what not, I know that they feel that even though you have accomplished this, that you

shouldn't be out of prison. And I can understand that as being a factor. What I've tried to do since I've been in prison as an individual was tried to extend myself to the parole community. I was abled by the business people in the community to set up an organization in the community that caters to the youth. As a matter of fact, there are two people from my board of directors sitting here right now. One happens to be or had his son taken from him and his son's killer came here to this institution, and this person still comes. At first, that wasn't his position, but his position came because of our relationship, and he thought that I was one that should be not in prison. And after he and I had some dialogue or he and I went through the dialogue of my behavior and what not, he since has changed his mind about the situation and has become a supporter of this parole eligibility, based on our relationship. But I just wanted to get in the fact of the victims of crime and I don't know how you can really tell a person who has lost a loved one that you're sorry, that you're remorseful and that sort of But we live in a forgiven society, and I think that we have to think more in that area of the people who are victims and try to bring them face to face with us at forums like this so that we can have an

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

understanding of how we are and that we are not just a number or a face in the newspaper, and I think the fact that you people came here, it's overwhelming. I mean, you're almost speechless when you can look like a forum like — this is almost unheard of, and I think Superintendent Vaughn and all the folks that are involved in this situation and the guys who are here that we were able to sit here. As a matter of fact, when I first heard this, I didn't believe that it would actually happen. But I guess after communism in Russia is being dismantled, anything can happen. And I would like to say sincerely that I sincerely appreciate each and every one of you here, and thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

Members from the committee, we do have Representative Jim Gerlach from Chester County joining the panel. Welcome, Jim.

Any questions from any of the members? Representative Birmelin.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: I have a question for four out of the five of you, and if it's all right with you, I'll call you by your first names. BY REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: (Of Mr. Wallace)

Q. Brian, I have a question for you on your testimony that you handed out here. You said,

1	"unfortunately, upon leaving Mr. Zanni fired a shot at
2	us and we panicked and shot back out of fear." You
3	have said one shot was fired, is that correct?
4	A. Yes. Upon leaving, one shot was fired.
5	Q. Who was the person that fired the gun?
6	A. At him.
7	Q. Yes.
8	A. That was me.
9	Q. Okay, I suspected as much from what
10	happened to you as compared to the other two people.
11	Were you aiming to kill him?
12	A. No, it was more so my intentions was to
13	get away. That came from fear, just hearing the shot
14	and I'm on my way out the door. I was running and the
15	shot was like ricocheted, and really like reflex
16	trigger there. You know, unintentional reflex that I
17	pulled the trigger.
18	Q. Where did you get the gun from that you
19	committed the crime with?
20	A. Ah
21	Q. Was it yourself?
22	λ. No, no. I got it from a lot in a paper
23	bag.
24	Q. You got it from where?
25	A. Around a lot, like an old lot, with tires

1 and--

- Q. You found it?
- A. It was in a paper bag.
- Q. Would I assume then that you took the gun with the intention of committing the robbery with it?
 - A. Yes, sir, that was my intentions.
- Q. It wasn't just something you were on the way to rob the store and you said, hey, here's a gun, let's take it with us?
 - A. No. I didn't find the gun that day.
 - Q. Okay. All right.
- BY REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: (Of Mr. Bainbridge)
- Q. I had a question for Bruce as well. In reading your testimony, it sounds to me from what you're saying here you were following this David Dunsavage shooting either in the air or at him directly, and yet one of the shots you fired at him ricocheted and hit an innocent bystander, is that correct?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. My question to you is why were you convicted of first-degree murder when he was not the intended target of what you were doing?
- A. I don't know. I was shooting at a car, and because David Dunsavage was in that car he was

supposed to be my victim. He testified he wasn't, you know, there was no animosity between us and I wasn't trying to kill him. It was -- I don't know. I'm not up on the law. For 12 years I don't understand.

- Q. I would think your attorney would have been.
- A. Well, the attorney said I should have never been convicted of first degree, but that's why.
- Q. I just question that. It would be my understanding that the motivation for first degree murder would be a prime reason for that conviction, and you did not have the motivation to kill an innocent bystander.
- A. Clearly, I do not know John Grivnovics.

 I know John Grivnovics now in my mind, but I never had
 no ill will toward him.
- BY REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: (Of Mr. Werts)
 - Q. I have a question for Tyrone.
 - A. Yes, sir.

б

- Q. Of the people that you represent in this lifers association, does that also include death row inmates or not?
 - A. No, sir. Just lifers.
- Q. None of the people that you represent would have a death sentence, capital punishment?

- A. No. Well, we would like to say that everyone who has a life sentence really has a death sentence, but we don't represent the death row inmates.
 - Q. Okay.

BY REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: (Of Mr. Tervalon)

- Q. And I only have one other question, that's for Kenneth. What is the book that you carried with you here today?
 - A. This is the Bible.
 - Q. Ah--
 - A. Why do I carry it?
 - Q. Yeah, that's the next question.
- A. About four years before the institution let me move outside there was an officer on the block who carried a Bible like this, and I'm not a religious guy, okay, I would like to said I'm a spiritual guy, I'm not a religious guy, and I thought it would be nice to have a Bible that I could put in my pocket, because I see this guy always carried a Bible in his pocket, and he didn't fit the form of a religious fanatic kind of a fellow. So I asked my parents if they would get me one that was like that, and they did. And since that time I've been fortunate to meet a lot of religious people, some spiritual people, and they got me interested in reading it.

I read a lot of books, but I never read this book all the way through, and it's not that long. So after I had it a couple of years, and it took a couple years, I decided I was going to read it, and the more I read it, the better off things get. There's a lot of good stuff in there. I don't understand it all, but there's a lot of good stuff in there. about guidance, wisdom, understanding, reproof. A prison sentence is reproof. It's correction. And I've come to understand from reading some things in here how much I hurt people and how much I hurt my family, all the people that helped me through the years, and how I need to give something back. And it gives me a lot of guidance. Keeps me on the straight track. There's a part in here where it cease from anger. And threaten not thyself, cease from anger, threaten not thyself to do any evil thing, I don't quote it very well, but there are times when I have to remember that. The steps of a good man are ordered in the Lord. there's a lot of things in there that help me to live right, the Lord's Prayer. It just helps me. This is a better book for me to read and follow to make sure I do what I have to do to get out of jail and do what I have to do to stay out of jail when I get out of jail.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. As an editorial comment on what you just

1 said, I appreciate your honesty and your sharing that 2 with us and I'm sure that you're sincere in the fact 3 that you carry it with you, but we also occasionally 4 hear at other public hearings and tour prisons and talk 5 to people who instantly get religion, if you will, and 6 I am not accusing you of that, so don't misread my 7 comments, so I appreciate the honesty with which you 8 shared that, but I wanted you to be aware that that 9 often happens. I've been on the Judiciary Committee 10 for I think five years now and I've toured many of 11 those same prisons that the Chairman has taken us to 12 and people in administrative positions in the prisons 13 will indicate that sometimes people do that.

- A. I know some of those people.
- Q. Yeah.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. I've lived with them for 20 years, and I can appreciate your position, why are you carrying it? I don't think I'm one of those people. I think some of these fellows will tell you I'm not one of those people. But it's been good for me. It's helped me.
 - Q. I appreciate you telling me.
- A. It's not the solution to every problem, but it helps me.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: I would ask one thing of all of you in general, and this is my last

question. Omar apparently of you five is the only one who claims not to have committed the crime that he was convicted of. I don't know if that is an accurate assumption or not, but how many people do you think of your 550 lifers who are here in Graterford today would fit his category, where he honestly believes that he is innocent of the crime that he was convicted of and should not be here?

MR. WERTS: Representative, I can't really give you any statistics on that.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: No, I don't ask for an exact number. But here's one of five that's saying this, and if I'm reading you wrong, tell me, but I think the other four of you are saying I committed the crime, I was convicted of it, I am guilty. He's not saying that. He's saying I was convicted of a crime that I don't think I was guilty of, and that's why he's fighting it. But I just wonder how that 550 number breaks down into people that think that they never got a fair deal through the judiciary system and how many of you are saying, yeah, I was convicted, I really did it, but I still think I should be eligible for parole?

MR. WERTS: Well, see that's one of the reasons why House Bill 1382 makes so much sense,

because every individual lifer would come in with different circumstances. There are some men who are here who are not guilty. There are a lot of men here who are guilty, and there are a lot of men here who feel that they are guilty of something, but are they guilty of murder? Like Omar, the scenario, I can give you some real life cases of they already mentioned Steve Blackburn. We have another fellow named Earl Rice who is out of Chester. He was 15 years old, him and another juvenile were walking down the street, Earl stopped to talk to a female friend, the other individual juvenile went around the corner and while he was around the corner he snatched a woman's pocketbook, the woman fell and hit her head and she died. back around the corner and they were arrested some time The individual that snatched the woman's later. pocketbook was certified as a juvenile and he served a minimal amount of time and got out. Earl has been in prison for 18 years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We have another situation named Robert Rowe, a man who is on medication now who was an innocent man. He drove two individuals to a store, to a bar, and while he went to park the car they decided to rob the bar and killed a man, came back, jumped in the car, and someone identified the car. Robert Rowe

was arrested, and when the police told him about the incident, he said hold it. He said, no, no. You can ask my two friends. I just drove them to the store. That's how the police got the other two individuals. He thought that he was giving himself an alibi that I was with two friends at that particular time. Those two individuals were arrested but they were found not guilty, and Robert Rowe was found guilty.

So that's why we said everyone has so many different circumstances, and you hear cases like that, you say, well, that's just one case. There are many cases like that where the perpetrator, the man who actually pulled the trigger will make a deal with the district attorney's office to testify against everyone else.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: But if you were to estimate how many of those 550 lifers would fit into that category, what would you say? Half of them? A third? A fourth?

MR. WERTS: I can't even think about it.

I just know that from dealing with the lifer population here at Graterford, there is a large percentage of men who have circumstances which under different circumstances they wouldn't even be here. I know that there are some men here who I know personally who are

not guilty who are serving life sentences. I know that there are men who sat in a car where the perpetrator has been since released and are still here in prison. I know some men who were -- killed someone who got found in the third degree, and they are eligible for parole, they go out and they're able to maintain their family ties, where someone who may not be as culpable is still here suffering, and that's basically why I really feel that the system needs to be changed so we can look at each individual case. This is an individual situation. And we can say just because there is a heinous crime that happened that we have to continually punish the 2,000 men and women in prison 10, 15, 20 years. A lot of things that's going on out in community today have no reflection on what someone did 20 years ago.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So to answer your question, I really don't know what the statistics are, but I could just say that everyone has varied circumstances and that's why we really need to add a mechanism where those circumstances can be looked at in a fair way and a determination based on that.

MR. BAINBRIDGE: Can I answer that, please? On Tyrone's piece, this is a big prison.

There are over 4,000 people in here. 550 of those are

lifers. It is really impossible for all lifers to know all lifers' case.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: No, I understand that, but I also know that he's the head of the association and there may be some information that he's aware of, maybe a survey of these guys or what, to know where they stand.

MR. WERTS: Well, we did have a survey, but, you know, a lot of people say they're not guilty. It's the level of guilt. That's what it is, you know.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: I just find it refreshing to find that there are people who are here who say they belong here and should have been convicted. I mean, you've heard the old story, the new superintendent goes into the prison, lines everybody up and says why are you here? And they all say, I'm innocent, I'm innocent, and he finds one guy that's guilty, he says, well, you better leave. You're corrupting all these innocent people.

So I appreciate your testimony, gentlemen. Believe me, I really do. And that's not to discredit what you're saying.

MR. ALI: What I was trying to point out was that not only myself, I would said who fall in the category that I do, that there are about 15 people that

I know personally who are on a class action suit for this very situation that I had, concerned the same circumstances that I had. The law came from the United States Supreme Court in 1986, if the jury was an across-the-board jury, then a lot of the decisions may have been different, and this is what the court has said, and I fall in that category, along with the 10 or 15 other individuals that I know personally in this situation in Graterford Prison. Now statewide, I couldn't give you statistics on that, but that's what I know here.

REPRESENTATIVE BIRMELIN: Thank you, gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative Reber.

REPRESENTATIVE REBER: Just real quick, because I know some of the other gentlemen want to have as much time or close to as much time as you fellows did. Just raise your hands, how many of you had court appointed counsel in your trials as opposed to counsel of your own choosing?

(No response.)

REPRESENTATIVE REBER: Do you understand the question?

MR. WERTS: Yes. It's obvious we all had

private.

REPRESENTATIVE REBER: You all had private counsel?

MR. WERTS: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE REBER: Your organization and I have something in common: You started in 1981 and I started in this job in 1981. I've gotten a lot of correspondence over the years from the lifers. I've been a member of this committee for going on 12 years. I think of all the colleagues here, you're looking at the ones that have been serving the longest time.

Just by way of information, it might be a good idea, because if this bill is ever going to have a chance of, one, getting out of committee; and two, being looked at by the full House, I get a lot of dissertations from lifers over the years. As a result of this bill and maybe some follow-up correspondence that you might have, try and keep it as short as possible and to the point, because it's voluminous the amount of letters that we get, and obviously you have a lot of time, you really put a lot of time into it, but I'm just thinking for the purposes of the General Assembly, and we need 102 people that are going to have to say yes for something like this to at least pass the House and 26 in the Senate, try and really get your

point as succinct as possible and, you know, we're going to try and be able to do a lot of the amplification for you as to it and that's the reason for these hearings. But I do know that when somebody takes the time, the correspondence we get is so voluminous and in the minds of a lot of people I don't think it might rise to the height of urgency where they are going to read a 35-page epistle, so just pass that along by way of information.

And it's been quite enlightening, the documentation that has come to us over the years from the organization, and I do commend Representative Carn for working on this. I am an attorney and I have been counsel in two homicide cases, so I do appreciate some of the ramifications and I know a little bit more than some people, and it's one of the reasons why I've been very anti-mandatory sentencing because in some instances, not in all, but every case is different, and I think everything has to be looked at on a case-by-case approach, and I do think there is some merit in this for a lot of reasons that were stated by the representatives.

Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. DUNKLEBERGER: I am going to throw this out, whoever wants to answer it may.

12 13

14 15

9

10

11

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

I notice when I read the resumes you have a number of academic achievements as well as your involvement with other very worthwhile activities here in the institution. When you were all incarcerated, you were incarcerated serving a life sentence with the knowledge, I assume, that there was no probation, no parole. Why did you, when you first came into the institution, I guess my question is, did you start to participate in these activities, or why didn't you just say the hell with it, I'm going to be here the rest of my life, why do anything?

MR. ALI: We never lost hope. I know not just myself but others, there was never a hopeless I believed that there would be change. I feeling. can't give you the date, the time or whatever, but there was always hope. And you went on in hoping that something like this would occur.

MR. DUNKLEBERGER: Are there some lifers in the institution that had that mentality like I'm never going to get out unless I do anything?

MR. ALI: In any given -- yes, you have a few that can't see the light at the end of the tunnel, so to speak. They still function, but they might not have the enthusiasm that some have, like ourselves, because we are directly involved. And we believe that

1

2

3

_

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

you have to make it happen, that you have that reality.

May I speak to that? When MR. TERVALON: I came to prison 20 years ago, there was a different gubernatorial administration, and release of lifers was to be expected, but in order to be released, you had to participate. You had to prove yourself. So many of us began participating in programs with the expectation that that same process would continue. It did not. But because we continued, we saw that there was a possibility of the law being changed, and in order to work towards getting the law changed we had to continue our education, continue to get involved with the community. So that was why many of us at that time continued.

MR. WERTS: And another reason, sometimes the seriousness of a charge or seriousness of a sentence crystallizes before an individual and it makes someone look back at his life and see where he's coming from, where he's going, and at times it's that point where change happens. Kenny had stated here earlier about the rehabilitative process. Superintendent Vaughn and his deputies and ORU education department do a great job. The system works in terms of rehabilitation. Sure, we could do better, but with the limited resources that they have available, I think

they do a good job. And basically, rehabilitation starts with the individual. And that's what happens. Sometimes like the seriousness of the crime, seriousness of the circumstances make you really look over your life and say, I got to make a change in my life. And so you move in that direction.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BAINBRIDGE: If I may add to that. When I was convicted, I wasn't yet sentenced and I seen, I heard of Graterford as being the big house, and it scared the hell out of me. My attorney turned to me and said, you're eligible for commutation in two years. Articles showed up in the newspaper after my conviction that I was going to do at least seven years, so I came in Graterford with an attitude. I was angered. pissed off. There was a lot of junk that had to go through me before I collected myself. And it was that that I went through, my anger stage, I went through my worthless stage, I met beautiful people here, both fellow inmates and volunteers, who gave me self-worth back. And that's what brought me back around. It's not the fact that I'm never getting out of here, because at this point I don't see myself getting out of here because my sentence is life, and that's where it's at. But what keeps me going now is my own self-worth with a good support system around me, and that

continues to work on me each day that I live.

MR. WALLACE: Myself, I come from this perspective here. I felt when I was incarcerated, I mean, when I first entered the institution, I was kind of young. I know I needed a lot of things, especially like schooling, and I was around, you know, people, fellow inmates, you know, older guys and they were pointing out, giving me basically a sense of direction, and at the same time I was blessed with and had some good counselors. The staff members, they would put in their performance report and directed me that, Wallace, enter such and such.

So I got into school, a few programs to help me since the years was lapsing and I said this is time I can use to do something positive with hopes and prayers one day I'll be blessed to get my freedom again. So I look at all of it as like a preparation stage, going through a process of preparation so when I am afforded the opportunity to get my freedom, then I'll be prepared for it. And if not, still this kind of preparation keeps me alive. It keeps my hope up. It keeps my faith going. And when I stop, it's like everything stops, so I die. So as long as this is going on in my life, then I'm going on. So I keep it going on.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DUNKELBERGER: I would like to thank you for your testimony and commend you on your achievements.

MR. WERTS: I would just like to say one other thing, and it has to deal with the question are their lifers who have just given up? That's one of the biggest problems that as an organization that we have to deal with, especially as Omar said earlier, when young guys come in, 17, 18, 20, 21 years old and they see us walking around the prison doing a lot of positive things, being role models. And they see that we have no opportunity to be released, they again ask that question, why should I go to school? Why should I be good? What reason do I have if I'm never getting out? Here's a guy, when we try to explain to young fellows that, look, you've got to go to school, you've got to get involved. I tell the guys a lot of times, you got to go to impulse control, things of that nature, but they don't see the worth because there is no situation where they feel they can really get out of prison.

And basically, people say that we have the commutation process. Commutation process is not a release mechanism for lifers. It hasn't worked these last 13 years. More lifers have died in prison than

have been released, and it's really not a criteria.

Any time the Governor feels he wants to let this person out, he can let them out. But this bill will set up a criteria, it will set up a criteria where guys have to meet a certain standard. That doesn't exist right now.

MR. DUNKELBERGER: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

Carn.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative Gerlach.

REPRESENTATIVE GERLACH: No.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: I would just like to get some of your responses to the issue on victims and victims' families. I remember quite vividly when I was 7 years old watching my uncle killed in Augusta, Georgia, and that's something that's stuck with me all my life, watching someone close to me killed. I still, have not been able to live with that in my own mind, and I feel that I'm a victim, too. But, you know, I want you to explain how you think victims should respond to this kind of bill.

MR. ALI: You know, I would truthfully like to see the victims and the accusers in a forum similar to this. If not like this, something similar

to that where they could confront one another and have some dialogue where all the questionings, all the guilt, all the emotions that are there could be laid out on the table where we can hash this thing out, so that we could see one another and share in one another's burden. If some sort of forum like this could be set up, I think there would be benefits to it.

Initially, we would probably have problems because there would be a lot of emotions involved. You can never really compensate a person for the loss of a loved one. You can never really do that. But the attempt, even in governments they give out a form of relief and what not to show the remorse in a sense. We attempt to do that with walkathons and recycling of cans and Big Brother and Big Sister and donate money, statewide, the Lifers Organization, we've been doing that for a number of years, but it doesn't totally compensate. But there's an attempt to change or to bring in the hurt, to cover the wounds as much as possible, and I think intent carries a long way. The same way of receiving a card, the message carries more weight than the actual just the material there.

And if something like that could be done, I don't think there's a cure-all response to that. I don't think I can see one thing that's the actual

answer. I think it's a conglomerate of factors that can make this thing become whole toward a degree. If we could explore this situation, perhaps we could come up with a solution on down the line, and that's just the way I'm seeing it now. And I don't know what my thinking is tomorrow, but I do know that we have to start somewhere with this, and the mere fact that you have some people sitting here that I know who have lost a loved one, who are here, who are ready to testify to how they feel, I think it's an indication of what I'm trying to get across here, that if we could have a face-to-face sit-down and start the dialogue and see what can transpire from this.

MR. WERTS: I would just like to say that that's a very tough question. I really don't know about what we would say, except that no matter what we do, whether we remain in prison for the rest of or lives, whether we are given the death sentence and die, it is never going to bring that person back. The most that we can say is that we're sorry. You know, a lot of our actions were not intentional.

I also know that there are a lot of victims who it's part of the healing process, who has forgiven. And this bill would allow a victim to have a say-so, to have a voice and to speak of their feelings.

Each man has to stand on that. Each individual person has to stand on that.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BAINBRIDGE: I think also that to bring victims together or attempt to bring victims together in our cases is a tremendous step and it's a giant risk taker from both sides, because to hopefully bring some sort of closure to, you know, a tragic situation as we're faced with here that we have before us is a lot. There is a lot there. And just to sit down and try to communicate, to listen, I think is a key, you know, to be a tremendous listener right now, because there's a lot of facts here, sidebars here that go on in each individual's case that, you know, like it will show that a lot of victims in cases are not intended victims. Now, there are circumstances that always happen and, you know, like we're tremendously sorry for stuff like that, that a tragic situation like that could happen and that we are responsible people and, you know, acknowledge and stuff like that.

I personally have to live with my victim for the rest of my life, whether -- and I don't think there will ever be a real closure, but I would still like to express to the family, my victim's family, how I feel, how, you know, how I didn't want to hurt him, that I'm terribly sorry for this. And if they could

just hear that, they can do whatever they wish to me, as long as I'm able to express myself in that fashion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WALLACE: I also, I would like, it is, like Tyrone said, it's a tough question to answer, like touch on it and touch on it. But I would like to be given the opportunity to talk to the victims' families myself, just to talk to them face to face. Ιt would give me some consolation, it would give me some relief because I went through a number of changes, a number of changes, and now, you know, I read newspapers and see the news and I talk to different guys. Killing, you know, it's a feeling that you can't even describe, and it hangs on you and you live it, you live it, you live it, and people who know you or know about it, they look at you with that. They look right at you with it, and you know it's on their minds, and like you're trying to say like, you're striving, constantly striving, striving, striving. You say, well, I won't try to kill myself as well as show other people I'm a better person. You know, that right there is not, you know, the direction I want to go in. I want my life to go in that direction.

It was judgmental error that took place in my life and I'm sorry for it, I would like to apologize, I would like to confront these families and

just let them see now where my intentions was then at what took place, where my heart is at now and just for us to like share that data. I think just the feeling we would give to one another, me receiving that feeling as well as extending it, that would give me some consolation, and I think would give the deceased family some consolation also. It would give them a description like. I get a chance look at you face-to-face and actually talk to you. Even though I know some emotions are there, I can identify with that because since my incarceration I lost five family members myself, and one was a friend of mine who shot my brother, and I wound up being in the company of him down in city hall while I was on trial. And we like grew up together and there was something I tussled with and tussled with it, and I'm saying, you're like a brother to me. I used to eat in your house, your mother would call my mother on me - I seen your son, he's out there doing something, little small stuff. I felt the closeness with him like he was a brother of mine. Even though I'm mad at him and what he done to my brother, but after time went on, time went on, years went on, I think that hurt healed. I said now I forgive him. I don't forget it, but I forgive him. Since then we don't talk or stuff, but still, I'm

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

mindful of what he done. But I know I got to forgive him to continue to grow. Then I really come to the realization I understand what I done. So I would want the deceased family to forgive me also.

So like, okay, now you've done that and it took place in your family, so now then you get a chance to deal with that. And still I tussle with it, still tussle with it, but as long as I can continue on the positives and doing positive things, I'm saying I'm a better person now. There's no way in the world that somebody can pull me in that direction there. No way in the world. No way. I got a nice direction now, I got a nice sense, I use good judgment. I like to think that I use good judgment doing what I'm doing before I do it, think it over, then I go in and proceed. Then a lot of negative stuff, you know, that's happened over there, I'll go in this direction.

But it's really a tough question to really touch. I would like to speak to my deceased family.

MR. TERVALON: It's a hard question.

It's a hard question.

MR. WERTS: But the fact of the matter is we have a couple of people in the audience who are also victims in the past, you know, that's why I tried to

make it plain off my opening statement that we are all victims. It's a really an ugly thing. Like Brian earlier this year, my baby sister was murdered, my wife's brother was murdered. We have some supporters back there who also had people murdered who support this bill who were able to deal with that pain and let it pass. So being a victim, it's a very tough thing and the only thing we can do is just add to that part of the healing process of victims.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TERVALON: Let me say something about that, too. When someone dies, when someone passes, there's a thing called the mourning process that we all go through. My father died recently and I went through the mourning process. When I was involved in this murder, that mourning process for the victim was interrupted. I didn't go to his funeral, I didn't get a chance to say to his family I'm sorry. So everything stopped right then the night I got arrested, that entire process stopped. And I've been going through it for 20 years at that point. I need to get that out of me. And I need to get it out of me with the victim's family because it's a participation. I was part of his death and I need to heal that and I need to heal that with his family. And that's why in our civilization, in our culture, we have the traditions that we do

surrounding death so that we can all grow through it, so that we can get through the process.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When people are involved in killings, some of them, for example these five men and the other men who are serving life, do not have the opportunity to continue the process. I can't speak for those persons who are convicted of a lesser crime category who get bail and come out of jail and are able to go see the victim's family and say, listen, I'm sorry for what happened. Perhaps some of them do. All of us who have been here for a long time want to do that. of us who are right thinking people want to do that. We know what we've taken. We know that the victim's family is angry, because most of us, if we're honest, get angry at ourselves. I get angry at myself for what I did. And we have to let them know, we're as angry at ourselves probably more than they are. But they are the person who suffered the loss, and we want to let them know that we want to help them in their loss. want to help them to get through their loss. Even at this late date, if there's something that we can do to help you get through your loss, let us help to do it.

MR. ALI: I would just like to say something. Tyrone mentioned the thing about his sister, and he and I were on the phone because I lived,

as I said, in the OSU area and he's inside, but we communicate because I head the Judiciary Committee out there in the OSU. Kenneth is also on the same committee. He and I were talking about the bill, and Tyrone said, by the way, would you tell my brother that my sister just got killed? Brother-in law. Pardon me, his brother-in-law. His brother-in-law and I work on the same detail out in the OS Unit, and it was like I had to be somewhat of a clergy person to tell his brother-in-law, who I worked with. When Tyrone told me, he really put something on me and I had to handle because to tell someone that death has come into their lives is not really an easy thing to do. And when I told him, his response that his wife was just killed, and the type of thing that -- he since went home, and he was somewhat taken back by it, like any human being would be. But the thing that sticks in my mind foremost when he was going home, the first thing he said is that I still support that bill, even though what happened to my wife. And I'm just saying that, and this has only been a short period of time because this only happened about a couple of months ago, you see.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. Thank
2	you very much. We appreciate it.
3	MR. WERTS: Thank you. Thank you very
4	much.
5	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Please introduce
6	yourself for the record, and if we could start from
7	there here and just go over, and then we'll come back
8	to this gentleman.
9	MR. JOHN WATTS, SR.: My name is John
10	Watts, grandfather of Sherilyn Good.
11	MR. JOHN F. WATTS: Yes, my name is John
12	Fortune Watts. I'm Sherilyn Good's brother.
13	MR. JOHN WATTS, JR.: My name is John
14	Watts. I'm Sherilyn Good's father.
15	MS. WATTS: My name is Patricia Watts,
16	and I'm Sherilyn Good's mother.
17	MS. HANNIGAN: I'm Sarah Hannigan. I'm
18	the sister of Patrick Hannigan.
19	MR. HANNIGAN: I'm Bill Hannigan. I'm
20	the brother of Patrick Hannigan.
21	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I am sure there's
22	statements that you want to make for the official
23	record, if you would like to just start with your
24	comments.

MR. JOHN WATTS, SR.: Okay.

Unfortunately, a few years back my granddaughter was murdered by her husband. He knew before he committed this crime the consequences, and he was found guilty of first-degree murder, sentenced to life in prison with no parole. I agree wholeheartedly with that sentence. He knew before he killed the young lady that he was going to be punished for it. He did the crimes, served the punishment. There's no way that I can see if I take your life that you will never come back to your family and I only spend 15 years possibly in jail.

That's all.

MR. JOHN F. WATTS: Well, I would just like to say that this caused a lot of grief in my family, and the most thing that really hurt my feelings was that my nephew and niece, my nephew is 8, my niece is 4, they were outside of the room when this happened. My nephew tried to call my sister, there was no answer, so he called my mother and father. He was that smart to know our phone number.

This caused a lot of grief in our family.

This has caused me to have a breakdown, and at the time

I did not believe that it had happened. It was not

real to me until a couple of hours later it sunk in

that it really happened. And what he did was a

lifetime thing. She cannot come back to life. And I

also in my heart believe that there should be some kind of action taken place for this. You cannot get away with something that's no punishment. If you don't get it here on this earth, when it comes time for you to leave you'll get it.

MR. JOHN WATTS, JR.: My daughter, Sherilyn Good, was born January 6, 1964. She died January 6, 1989. She was 26 years old. We just had her birthday party. The man that killed her was her husband. He planned it, he hounded her, he harassed her, only because she did not want him anymore. This was not something that came out of the heat of passion but because she would not support him, because she would not be with him. He would rather see her dead than to be with someone else.

I listened to the testimony of the other inmates here today and to the gentleman that was speaking on behalf of the inmates that's a part of the Judiciary Committee, and I can understand where maybe there have been some inmates who have been committed to life for crimes that they haven't committed or their sentences should be reviewed, but I do believe that life in prison without parole is life in prison. Why use the word "life in prison" if it means nothing? If life in prison means that they can access parole after

15 years or 20 years, why use the word "life"?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When this man took my daughter's life, it was done. There was no more life. She ceases to exist except in our imaginations and our memories and our I hear her calling my name. I can hear how she used to refer to me. I can see her standing in front of me and many of the things that we have done in the past. These things are still vivid in my memories, and they will always be. But for the person who took her from us so devastated our home, left us with two grandchildren who are well adjusted now, who have been able to overcome this tragedy even though they were there and present at the time it took place. Shawn is 9, Salina is now 6. They are both adjusted, they are doing well in school. The thought of this man coming out of prison and being able to access them horrifies Horrifies me to know and to think that he can commit a murder, he can kill their mother and then he can come out and confront them at some future date before they are adults horrifies me. And I am totally, 100 percent against it.

MS. WATTS: I agree with my husband. Our daughter, she was murdered, and not only did he murder her, but he robbed her of her jewelry, he put a pillow over her face, padlocked the door and left the two

children downstairs. It was our grandson who called to let us know that he heard his mother scream. My husband had to go there and literally kick down the door to get in to her. I proceeded to do CPR because I thought maybe, maybe there was that possibility of life. Okay?

she left two children behind. That puts me in the role of not only the grandmother but a mother, too. I have to assume this position. It's been a hardship for us. As my son spoke, he had a nervous breakdown. We're going through a very trying time adjusting.

We don't want anything from the system as far as welfare. I taught my daughter to work hard. You have a sound mind, a strong heart, two strong hands, work for your living. Pull yourself up. It's okay for those who have to be on it, but it's the idea that her husband did not want her to work. He wanted her to be on welfare. She tried to pull herself up, get a job, she was going to go on to school for R.N., and he saw that he was losing his meal ticket, so that's why he killed her. This was premeditated. He went for months saying he was going to kill her.

My husband and I, we work overtime, 16 hours two and three times a week so we can make ends

meet. As far as these families of these prisoners being on welfare and they can get out, they are rehabilitating themselves, fine, this is all well and good, but how come they didn't think before they did this crime?

It's just that I just feel as though the crime should fit the punishment, and I don't feel that they should be allowed to be out in society. If they did it once, who's to say they might not do it again? I don't want to be harassed. We get threatening letters from him now while he's incarcerated, and I don't think it's fair. I don't want to have anything to do with him, I don't want to ever confront him in the future. The wound that he put in my heart will last forever. Time will heal it, but it will never take away the pain and grief that he has caused our family to suffer.

MS. HANNIGAN: I'm here with five members of my family representing our entire family and my murdered brother. We're here to voice our opposition to this bill mostly because you took 12 people, 12 normal people from society and asked them to give up two, three, four weeks of their time to hear testimony, to make a judgment on this person and then to decide what punishment would fit this crime. My concern is

that this seven-member committee that's going to make these decisions are not average people. These are people who probably lean towards the criminal, with the exception of the Attorney General's Office. I'm not sure what the people are exactly, but I'm assuming two of them will be social workers or the type of people who wanted to get involved in this type of thing, and you already have a different way of thinking than the average person.

б

Our country and our criminal system and our jury system is made up to say 12 normal people will decide after hearing all this testimony if this person is guilty and what this person should have to get as punishment, and I think that's the way it should stand, unless you want to rewrite the whole Constitution, which I don't think you should be getting into.

Also, these people, the murderers decided to take it upon themselves to end someone's life. I just don't see where -- the victim had no shot at making any kind of a decision about this. They weren't able to voice their opposition to this sentence they were getting. Someone decided to end their life. Now these people, I mean, it's just that I think it's indicative of how far the country has gone towards the criminal's rights that these people would even have the

audacity to come up here and ask that their punishment, they should not have to pay for what they did. They should be able to be reviewed. The Governor is probably a normal person, didn't want to be a social worker, was elected by normal people to take this job, I think it should be left in his hand to review any cases.

That's really all I have to say that you would be interested in hearing. Do you want to say anything?

MR. HANNIGAN: Okay, I just want to say that if someone deliberately takes someone else's life, then they should pay with their own life. The government is unwilling to use the death penalty, or the court system is not willing to enforce it, the least you can do is to protect the rest of society by leaving that person in prison where they can't harm anybody else. Just because somebody is a model prisoner, he's in a controlled environment. You take away those restraints and put them back in society, why won't he go out and just do the crimes again? You have statistics on people who leave prison for lesser crimes, over 50 percent of them return to jail for some reason or another. Why would the percentages be better for murderers? These are guys that did the worst

possible crime, and now you want to let them walk the streets again where they may have a chance to do it again. I say no way.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: If I could, I think most of you were here during the testimony that was given previously, and as was stated, cases are different, circumstances are different. If in the case, let's say, where someone is in a car and a couple of his friends are--

MR. HANNIGAN: Well, can I say something? CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Sure.

MR. HANNIGAN: That's something that should be decided at the trial. That's something where people have the evidence in front of them, they should weigh all that right there. That shouldn't be something for the prison system to handle. The act was done before they were in prison, so the jury should decide whether or not they're a first-degree, second-degree or third-degree murderer.

is, and our system is not a perfect system. We don't write perfect laws, we certainly are not perfect people. Circumstances in almost every case can be somewhat different. You and I could be friends, I go in to pull a hold-up, you know nothing about it, I pull

the trigger and kill somebody during that hold-up, I come out, we take off, you may not even know that the gentleman was killed. I have a good attorney. I get at hung jury. I walk. You get committed to life. Is it fair?

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It may not be fair, but MR. HANNIGAN: again, that's the trial and that's something that should be handled at the trial. That's not the prison's determination to make. The trial system, this is the only course the victim has. The victim's family, at least they could see this guy brought to trial and hope for justice, and if the jury, after hearing all the evidence, convicts this man, he gets first-degree murder, in the sentence base of the hearing, the attorney for the defendant will say, please, spare his life. Just give him life in prison. He'll never be able to walk the streets again. beg you to please give life in prison rather than take his life. So now you're saying, okay, give him life in prison, but, you know, after 10, 15 years we'll let him out again, you know.

The fact that that guy was maybe just an accessory or maybe just happened to be a victim of it, you know, everybody convicted of murder in Pennsylvania automatically has a review of his trial. There's an

1 automatic appeal if you're convicted of murder in 2 Pennsylvania, and I feel as though that the court 3 process should be dealing with what sentences people 4 get and not the prison authorities or any legislative 5 board. 6 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: **Questions?** 7 MS. MILAHOV: Could you say how long ago 8 it was that your brother was murdered, please? 9 MR. HANNIGAN: My brother was murdered 10 July of '79. 11 MS. HANNIGAN: Twelve and a half years 12 ago. 13 MR. HANNIGAN: His murderer was just 14 convicted in January of 1989. 15 MS. MILAHOV: Do you have any idea why it 16 took so long? 17 MS. HANNIGAN: They didn't have enough 18 evidence. 19 MR. HANNIGAN: They didn't have enough 20 evidence. 21 The Attorney General's MS. HANNIGAN: 22 Office didn't want to bring charges against them until 23 they had an extra witness. MS. MILAHOV: Have either of you or any 24 25 of your family sought counsel with a minister or with

anyone else that would help you deal with your grief?

MS. HANNIGAN: No, we deal with it with

3 | ourselves. We help each other.

MS. MILAHOV: Do you feel that you have dealt with it in a good social way?

MS. HANNIGAN: Yes. This is a whole separate matter. Yes. This is a whole separate matter. This is you people deciding to change laws and you people deciding to change punishments that 12 normal people decided to impose on someone; people who didn't want to be social workers.

MS. MILAHOV: Well, excuse me--

MR. HANNIGAN: Also, the people, like we had witnesses at the trial who like they were under the impression that if they testified and this man was convicted that he would never be in a position to cause them any harm. Now 15 years from now he could walk down the street and he could cause harm to these witnesses that we had and the jurors and everybody involved in the case.

MR. JOHN WATTS, JR.: We dealt with our grief ourselves also within our own family structure. We have a close family structure, but our major concern I think during the course of the grief was not so much our own feelings, because even though we lost our

daughter, we knew where she was. It was the concern of the children, Shawn and Salina, and the anger that my wife and I felt about being pushed into this position. We're in our 40's. We had our children in the 60's so when we got into our 40's we wouldn't have to have children, and now we're starting all over again in our 40's with children all over. It's not fair, but that's the way life dealt the cards, so we'll work with it that way. And I feel that if that's the way life has dealt his cards, then he should be where he is.

I understand that there may be people there who don't belong, but as the gentleman said earlier, everyone in prison most of the time says they are not guilty of what they did anyway. But then there may be some that are guilty of some lesser crime. I don't know if this is the board that should review what they did or what they didn't do. If they didn't do what they were convicted of, then it should be picked up and appealed and the sentence should be reversed. But I don't think it should be the arbitrary decision of a board of legislators to decide whether the sentence should stand or not stand based on the inmate's description of what happened. We sat here and listened to the inmate's descriptions of what happened. That doesn't mean that it necessarily happened as the

inmate described it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The man that was shooting the gun at the car had no business with the qun. And if he didn't shoot the innocent bystander he would have shot the man in the car. You can't shoot at someone and not intend to kill them. I mean, suppose he had just shot the innocent man in the leg. The man could have laid there It wouldn't have been a mortal and bled to death. wound, but he could still have died. Does that make it any lesser crime, the fact that he didn't intend to kill the man, all he wanted to do was scare the man? He shouldn't have had the gun. I do not own a gun. I do not own any weapons. I did not keep them in my home, I do not expose them to them. I try to teach them better than that based on the teachings that my mother and father gave me.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Can I?

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: There was a young lady.

MS. AGNES HANNIGAN: I calmed down. All right, I will tell you.

It took 10 years for that hearing to come up, for the trial of the man who killed my brother to come up because they were very, very careful about gathering the evidence and making sure that they had

the right person. Everything was brought forth in the trial, and that's when it was supposed to be decided and it was decided. And I'm sure he'll have an appeal, and he'll probably have three appeals, but his sentence right now should not be in anyone else's hands except the court system and the jury's.

And you spoke of how much it costs to keep these prisoners, if we can't afford them, then maybe we should just put the death penalty back into effect a little more seriously. And that there are 550 lifers in the prison, there are 550 dead people because of them, okay? So they're not, you know, we don't have to keep worrying about them and their rights. They gave them up when they took someone else's life. Okay.

MS. MILAHOV:

Thank you.

I would like to make something very, very clear though. This panel does not have the power to change Pennsylvania's law simply by hearing testimony and reviewing the facts as we see them. I do feel that that was a misunderstanding from all of the people that have spoken just now. This is merely a factfinding hearing and we are trying to give equal weight to all people who are here to say, yes, I think this is a good idea, or I think this is a horrible idea, and that's

why it's a public hearing.

Also, I am not a Representative, but I do want to speak for the Representatives and that is that I do take exception to the idea that everyone on a panel such as this would have social work type training that would lean toward freeing prisoners at per se, because every Representative has been voted in by a constituency of approximately 59,000 normal people. They are representing their constituency, and they are voted in to their office just as the Governor is voted into the office.

MR. JOHN WATTS, JR.: But we all know that those who are voted in under a constituency don't always vote the way of their constituency.

MS. MILAHOV: And neither does the Governor.

MR. JOHN WATTS, JR.: Neither does the Governor. Many of the votes are perpetrated by their own personal experiences or feelings in the matter, regardless of what the majority says.

MS. MILAHOV: And we're very pleased that you came and gave your testimony because it gives a much more rounded picture of the whole situation.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: If I may, I deeply have sympathy for all of you, your families, because

again, I'm a victim, too, and I felt that pain.

One of the things that my pain had me believing should be is the law at the time that I lost my relative was that this individual should die. That was my feeling. Do you feel, given the experience that you have undergone, that from your perspective that the solution was death for the individual?

MR. JOHN WATTS, JR.: No.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Okay.

MS. WATTS: No, I don't think so either. I feel as though God is in control of all situations, and if these people come to know the Lord while they are in prison, good. That's the ministry for the Lord, to rehab. They can be a structural force for the younger ones coming in. Maybe they have a chance to get out there into society, but I feel if you do something as devastating as taking a life, then yes, you should be punished for your crime. If it was my own son who took a life, I would not appeal for him to be out. I'd feel as though you did something wrong, you should be punished for it. And I feel the same way for every other person that gets into it, if it's not in self-defense.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: So your position then, if you don't think that it should be a death

penalty, you're saying it should be life until they die? Is that what you're saying?

now.

MS. WATTS: I feel life instead of the death penalty. And if there's not enough prisons, then build more. I would gladly give half my paycheck. I would gladly work extra hours.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: That day is coming.

MS. WATTS: Well, it's just about here

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: You're right.
Could I get your feelings?

MS. HANNIGAN: I believe in the death penalty, but everyone in my family does not, so we were satisfied.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: I would just like to share with you a perception of a member of the Judiciary Committee who happens to be from Philadelphia and sits next to me who does not support my bill, and we're friends, and she said to me, and I want to get your reactions to her perception, that the reason she does not support my bill is because she feels that if we allow for this process, there would be more sentencings of death from juries and judges. Now, that's why she said she does not support it, because she feels that if that becomes the law, then juries and

judges would sentence more people to death. What is your response to that?

MR. HANNIGAN: Well, I know in our case after the man was convicted of first-degree murder, his lawyer assured the jury, please spare his life because he'll never have a chance to walk the streets alone. That's what his lawyer said.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Right.

MR. HANNIGAN: And as a result of that plea the jury said, okay, we'll go with life in prison rather than the death penalty, you know, because they were assured at the hearing that he'll never walk the streets again.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: But do you think their decision might have been different if they felt that he had an opportunity for parole?

MR. HANNIGAN: I do.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Okay.

MR. HANNIGAN: I think if they, after hearing how he bludgeoned and murdered my brother, that this is evidence that they heard nine years after the fact and they convicted him, and I feel as though that that would have been strong enough for the death penalty if life imprisonment wasn't the other alternative. If they said 15 years, will you give him

15 years, I think they would have said, no, we'll give him the death penalty.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: What do you think in your case?

MR. JOHN WATTS, JR.: I think he probably would have been given the death sentence based on that, but in our case it was prearranged during the trial that there would be no death sentence handed down for his willing to cooperate, to cut down on court costs and time. But from what I can understand from friends who are presently in law school and who are lawyers, that the cost of executing a prisoner often outweighs the cost of keeping him incarcerated for the rest of his life because of appeal costs and other judicial costs that we as laypeople are unaware of. know if this is a factor in much of the decisionmaking in reference to not following through the death penalty or is it because Pennsylvania tries to be a more moral State in reference to that type of thing.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE GERLACH: I just have one question for you, and it really deals with a bill that's been introduced, not part of this proceeding today but it relates very closely to what we're talking

about.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The U.S. Supreme Court held recently under a Michigan case that came before it that evidence at the time of sentencing on the impact of a murder on the family of the murdered victim could be introduced at the sentencing hearing on the question of what the sentence ought to be. And in that case in Michigan, if I recall fairly accurately, a mother and one child were murdered by the accused. The son, who was just a few years old, witnessed the murder and then hence after the murder in living with other family members had nightmares and all that sort of thing, would wake up and ask where his monmy was and all that sort of thing. And in that Michigan case, that evidence was introduced at the sentencing hearing as relative to what the sentence out to be. The Supreme Court held that that Michigan statute is not unconstitutional, and as a result there's a bill before the General Assembly to allow that kind of evidence in Pennsylvania. λs members of victims' families, what would be your thoughts on that?

MR. JOHN WATTS, JR.: I think it would be a good bill to allow the families to express to the court what their loss or the tragedy has done to their families. Someone here has talked about the accused's

rights. When our daughter was murdered, the district attorney represented the State in the matter. He did not represent our daughter. Our daughter had no say in what transpired at that trial. We had no say in what transpired at that trial. So subsequently, my daughter was murdered without any say at all as to what was to happen to the individual that murdered her.

I think it's very good, that it would allow the family to speak on behalf of the person or on the behalf of the family as to the extent of this loss in reference to the family, what it has done in the upheaval of that family and almost breaking a family apart at the rift from what was once one is now less than that. Yes, I think the bill would be very good.

MS. HANNIGAN: Yes, I think it would be helpful also. In our case we got exactly what we wanted, pretty much, first-degree but life, because my parents do not approve of the death penalty. So in our case it wouldn't have helped us any, we got pretty much what we wanted, but I think a lot of people probably would feel better if they could get up there and express themselves, since his family paraded all these people in front of him that held, well, he's a victim of the circumstances and all. They were allowed to do that, so I think we should have been going up there and

saying exactly what my brother had accomplished, how good a person my brother was, and to be murdered in his sleep by someone who decided they needed \$318, I think it should be expressed. I think the victims should be represented by their family, yes.

MR. HANNIGAN: I agree.

REPRESENTATIVE GERLACH: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. Thank you very much.

We'll next hear from Sue Beard, Alice Johnson, and Pauline Velasquez.

If you would start your testimony from right to left and start your testimony and whatever comments you would like to make.

MS. JOHNSON: My name is Alice Johnson, and my husband is serving a life sentence and he will be here 15 years next month. And House Bill 1382 is titled Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act, and I think this bill could do what the people want, the system is meant to do, and that's to rehabilitate.

Everyone that has testified for the bill basically said the same thing that I'm about to say.

The bill, it's for -- it's not for everyone that has a life sentence, it's a case-by-case, it's on a

I think are very pronounced because you have to go through a series of programs to be eligible for the program. To become eligible for it doesn't mean that you will be released. It doesn't mean that.

And as far as the survivors of victims, they would always have the say-so written in law in someone's release. They would get a report from the parole board -- well, it would be a statement for parole. It wouldn't be that someone is being paroled and the victims would be contacted. If they chose to speak orally or write something, it's their option, you know. It's not just for lifers, it's for survivors of victims also.

Like I said earlier, the prison doors will not be open for everybody that has a life sentence. Everyone that has a life sentence didn't commit the act. Everyone that has a life sentence didn't know that someone's life was going to be taken. And in some cases they may have, even though they didn't commit the act. That's why it states that it's a case-by-case basis. The committee, there's different committees on this bill. They would review, you have a major review committee, you have a review committee that's the initial process that the person would have

to go to to become eligible, and if they messed up somewhere down the line, they would not have to go all the way back to the beginning if the committee saw fit that they should come through that process again.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And by dealing on a case-by-case basis, all individuals involved, all the different committees that are involved get to know the inmates as individuals, not just a name and number, these people have personalities also, okay? And I think that the women and men that are serving life sentences, the majority of lifers in most institutions are, I guess you would say, model inmates, the majority of them. You don't really have any problems from them in these institutions. I think if they were given the opportunity to be put back into the mainstream of society, there are positive and productive people in the penal institution, and if they were given the opportunity to be released into society, they would continue to show how positive and productive they can be. And that way they would be contributing back to what they took from society.

It costs money. And this is not all about money because there's so much more involved here. You have lives on both sides as far as the survivors of the victims and the accused murderer or the murderer

themselves. I think that 1382, House Bill 1382 I think is the right way to go. You're not changing the law, you're not making laws. I just think that some people should be given an opportunity to put back into the mainstream.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you.

MS. BEARD: My name is Susan Beard, and I'm the wife of a lifer in the State of Pennsylvania. Forgive me, I have something to read which I'll give you a copy of afterwards.

We appreciate the opportunity to come before you to speak about House Bill 1382 which would provide the possibility of parole review to a person serving a life sentence in the Commonwealth of To some people lifers are simply Pennsylvania. murderers. To many people lifers are husbands, wives, fathers, mothers, sons, daughters, brothers, sisters, friends, and fellow human beings. Some of us who care about lifers have even lost someone in our family to murder. We know full well the acts that caused our lifers to be in the position that they are and we are sorry for those acts. If you had a chance to talk to the lifers you would find many of them who are also sorry. And we know that most of them are not cold-blooded murderers who sat back and made great

plans to take a life. Some never killed anyone but were simply along with the killer. Some accidentally killed, for example a person dying of a pre-existing condition during the commission of a robbery. Some were juveniles or mentally impaired. A lot grew up poor and disadvantaged and started on this road as children that society failed. Some would say, if we only had the money to retain our own counsel, things might have been different.

We realize that this does not diminish the pain felt by family members due to the loss of a loved one. For this we are sorry. We would like to be able to put back what was lost. We can't. We would like to make some contribution to the healing process, but most of us are struggling under the burdens of incarceration. Those of us who are fortunate enough to have the money for private counsel to defend our loved ones are wiped out. A lot of us have lost our breadwinner. Children are being raised without their fathers or mothers. We are struggling under the cost of maintaining our relationship with our lifer, trying to pay for collect phone calls, traveling to distant prisons and subsidizing their meager prison wages.

Minorities make up a disproportionate amount of lifers as compared to their percentage in the

general population. Why? Read the headlines. "U.S. Incarcerates Most In The Civilized World," "Poverty Rates Increase," "Taxes Raised," "Social Services For Women And Children At Risk Cut," "One In Four Black Youths Under Court Supervision." What's the correlation? How does this apply here? We are locking up our husbands, fathers, wives, mothers in increasing numbers and for longer periods of time. The cost of incarcerating some of the individuals is draining our budget of funds that should be going to take care of our children, our elderly, and other people who cannot take care of themselves.

While other programs are cut, we continue to pour money in our prison system. If we had the money spent to incarcerate our loved ones for one year it could be used a lot more productively if they were home just to support our family.

Some of our lifers have been locked up for 20 to 30 years. In case anyone might think that prisons are country clubs, they aren't. People in prison and their families are often robbed of human dignity. Achieving humane treatment can be a fight. Overcrowded conditions, medical attention and a fair and just disciplinary system are among the issues.

Some of us have been told by

administrators that we are too involved in the treatment of our loved ones. We decry about conditions of prisons in other countries, yet I don't think that there are many who would look at the inhumanities in our prisons and not feel compassion and say enough is enough.

And I would just like to say to the family members that I have felt brutalized by the system and I had to seek help to deal with my anger of what was done to us.

Despite all the negative aspects of the prison environment, we have noticed that the lifers are the ones who consistently work to better themselves and positively affect the lives of those in their community both inside and outside the prison. Family programs, literacy programs, charity programs, you look at these and who is in the forefront but the lifer?

We also see that they are not the same person as they were when they went into the system but a more responsible person, a more capable person, a person that has changed. Let's look at ourselves. Are we the same person as we were 10, 15, 20 years ago? I hope not. Haven't we learned from our mistakes and become better people as a result of that learning? Yes, we have all made mistakes, and true, given the

right moment we are all capable of doing what has landed these lifers in prison, or worse. But people change. We can't undo the past, but we can bring a positive note to the future.

provide for those who have demonstrated that they are worthy an opportunity to give back to their families and their victim's families some of what was taken away as a result of their actions to aid in the healing. It would show the ultimate human expression of forgiveness to those of us who struggle under this life sentence. It would provide for the effective treatment and programming for our lifer. Other States have long had a method to periodically review lifers for release.

Pennsylvania is only one out of four that does not.

This program is sensitive to the input of the victims' families. They are an active part of the process.

Lifers in the past who received commutation from the Governor's office have shown to have a far less recidivism rate than people incarcerated for other offenses. Our government is set up on the system of checks and balances, and with the court being the one who decides the sentences, it seems that if the legislator could act as a check to that, it would be good. It's like a living death having your

•

husband incarcerated. You always worry something might happen in these overcrowded jails. You never know.

In closing, we would ask you as our legislators to support House Bill 1382, which would act as unbiased evaluator of this situation and would look at all people involved in this difficult situation and create a nonpolitical system to evaluate the possibility of freeing of our loved ones. It seems appropriate as we approach this very special season of the year to a lot of us the topic would be a method of providing forgiveness to our fellow man and their families.

Thank you.

MS. VELASQUEZ: Honorable

Representatives, I thank you for the opportunity to come here today to this hearing. My name is Pauline Velasquez. I'm co-chair of the Pennsylvania Lifers Support Committee. I work with the lifers on the outside and I also come into the prison to work with the lifers. They are human beings just like anyone else. They have been rehabilitated and they're wonderful people. I'm not saying all, I'm saying the majority of them that I have had dealings with.

I would like to also say that I have a son with a life sentence who got involved with drugs

1 an 2 sh 3 of 4 id 5 fe 6 I 7 TI 8 a 9 st 10 be

and the wrong people and there was an accidental shooting. I am also the victim of a shooting. My other son was killed by a police officer by a mistaken identity. But I hold no remorse. I hold no bad feelings. I did at first. I was hateful, I was angry, I was bitter towards the whole world because of it. This police officer still works in the district, he has a desk job, and I don't think that's fair. I sympathize with the feelings of the victims, but as me being also a victim, I want someone to sympathize with me and know that I would like to have my son released.

Excuse me, I'm a little nervous.

There are many lifers serving a life sentence who were only at the wrong place and received a life sentence. It is not fair they should spend the rest of their life in prison. House Bill 1382 should be passed so these cases can be reviewed. In California, life cases are reviewed every seven years. Pennsylvania is one of four States that does not have some sort of relief mechanism. We have commutations, but with Governor Thornburgh, in his eight years only seven were commuted. Governor Casey has commuted 25, and in his second term. During the Thornburgh and Casey administrations, 81 lifers died in prison.

We need this bill passed. It will help

the pressure of the family, it will help the prison system. If my son should have to spend the rest of his life in jail, that means I spend my life with him also, and that's not fair. I pray that you will consider this bill and help support this bill.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you. Thank you, ladies.

Hugh Colihan, Stephen Blackburn, Anthony Jacobs and Lois Williamson.

If you would like to introduce yourself for the record and then make your statements.

MR. COLIHAN: Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Respected members of the committee, I appreciate the invitation very much. It came as a surprise. I thank Mr. Krantz, and it's a pleasure to be here.

My name is Hugh Colihan. I'm the
Assistant District Attorney in Philadelphia. My job is
in the homicide division. I've worked in the District
Attorney's Office for about 17 years, working in
various units within the office, spending a great deal
of time in the juvenile unit, involved in the
prosecution of juveniles for various kinds of
delinquency acts or offenses, the rape unit, major
crimes unit, finally for the last four or so years

homicide, and I guess I probably have a hand in some of the fellas that are in here today. It is a privilege to be here.

MR. JACOBS: My name is Anthony Jacobs. Excuse me, I am trying to recover from a cold.

I was recently commuted after serving 23 years as accessory to a murder. I am now released on parole and I am serving the community. I am a counselor, too. I work at a coeducational school for adjudicated delinquents and also dependent youth.

MR. BLACKBURN: My name is Stephen
Blackburn. I'm a recently commuted lifer just in March
of this year. I am currently on pre-release and am in
a halfway house situation in Philadelphia. I was
convicted of being an accessory to murder. I am
currently a student at Temple University and am working
in providing emergency services to needy families in
Philadelphia.

MS. WILLIAMSON: I am Lois Williamson. I am a victim of murder twice. I am also chairperson of a national group called Citizens United for the Rehabilitation of Lifers, and executive director of the Pennsylvania chapter, and I would like to have my say. Would you like me to rebut first, because I would like to—

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Well, I think you wanted to -- did you want to make a statement, Hugh, for the record?

MR. COLIHAN: Mr. Chairman, thanks very much. I would appreciate an opportunity to make a statement, and I had a loosely organized idea of what to say to the panel this morning, all of which dissipated as I reacted to the statements of the many respected people who came before me.

I would like to say a few things, however, if I may, and I will be brief. You've been very patient and you haven't had a break yet.

I don't think that the bill ought to be considered, and I do oppose the bill. I don't think that the bill ought to be considered as a way of solving the problem of the cases that were tried, the ones that had unsatisfactory results where years after the verdict is entered people might question the validity of the verdict, the soundness of the verdict, the propriety of the verdict. Efforts to retry cases after the verdict is in are a labyrinth you will never get out of. For example, with the panelists that appeared earlier whose cases have been before the Board of Pardons many times, and I've been up there myself for about seven years running, with one year absence.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With respect to these issues that the prisoners bring forward about the quality, if you will, of their conviction, to talk about the conviction by an all-white jury and the Batson issue, as we call it, conjures up notions of Charles Diggs, who recently got himself a new trial after numerous Federal habeases on the accusation that the prosecutor in the case was racist because the jury was all white. It was the third time the case was tried, the guy goes back, and in order to avoid the death penalty he pleads to life. In other words, he admits that he killed the young lady, along with Alfred Clark and Louis Riggins and other people, Clark himself being now dead. So that is an issue, but it is something best left to the courts. It's the Batson issue, we call it.

with respect to Mr. Tervalon, an accomplice liability is one of the reasons that so many people are convicted and properly sentenced to life imprisonment. I often argue at the Board of Pardons and before juries that I'm on trial before, in fact I'm on trial now and was excused for the day to be here, that the problem of conspiracy is that where you have 3, 4, 5, or 10 people involved in a crime and maybe not one of them has the spine to face somebody face up and do what they are going to do, the 10 of them together

or the 3 together or the 5 together may find that they have a spine that will go up against a victim and take the life of a victim. So the law wisely punishes the co-conspirator. It wisely punishes the accomplice, because maybe but for the fact of an accomplice this one person who was the ultimate actor and the taker of the life may not have had the guts to do it himself. So that's why we have that law on the books. I would ask the panel not to reconsider the wisdom of that law.

With respect to whether the bullet hits somebody other than somebody who might have been within the scope of intent, like the passerby at the bus stop, the law of transferred intent is clear. If you intend to kill somebody, if it's a malicious and intentional act and you do take a life, even if it's the wrong one you're not vindicated or exculpated, you're not free from responsibility, your responsibility is not mitigated simply because you took the wrong person's life. That law the clear. Please don't consider that when you consider this bill or the propriety of it.

Situational developments do abound in the law. They are men that I've had something to do with being in this building and I regret that they are here, but they're here and they must remain here. I think of one young man, Louis Iamo, I assume he's in Graterford

now. It's a pathetic thing that he is spending the rest of his life in prison, but the law dictated the wisdom that he should do so, and I ask that these cases not be tried by the bill.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Disparate sentencings are horrible When a person gets acquitted or a person gets things. 3 1/2 to 10 while an accomplice goes away for life addresses the inequity that the actor, the shooter, the stabber went away to the street, got only 3 1/2 years. There's a prisoner in this building now, Edward Ryder, is doing life. He was an accomplice along with other people. Among the four people, Theodore Brown and Edward Ryder and Kenny Coville and Michael Grant, Michael Grant himself dead, Kenny Coville gets a new trial, got 10 to 20, went out and killed another person, he's back in here right now. Got a new trial. With respect to Mr. Ryder still seeking redress through means outside the judicial system by asking further people to reconsider, reconsider the facts of the case? Never. Please, I would invite you, don't ever do that. Stick with the issue before you.

Is there wisdom in this bill? I would submit, with all due respect, that the wisdom lies in the way we are presently constitutionally set up to treat with the cases before us. It is odd that when

one drives up the walk here, the drive, that the
Department of Corrections' sign will be out there and
that that should surprise someone, that they talk about
corrections. Is that a euphemism for warehousing or is
it really a fact? I'd say if you have corrections up
on the sidewalk, then doggone it, make this a
department of true corrections. If it is a
penitentiary, then call it the penitentiary. Don't
drown yourselves in euphemisms.

paper, don't have people questioning whether or not what do you really mean here, and you have to look into the appendix or the glossary to find out what life really means. The dictionary tells us what life really means. Life is that which is imposed for the taking of a life under certain circumstances. I would ask you to allow Pennsylvania to remain one of the few States in the union that does not bury itself with euphemisms. We don't have a subterfuge. When I try a case, the verdict comes back, it's first- or second-degree murder, the family of the victim turn to me, they say to me what does that really mean? And I can now look at them straight in the eye and I can keep my chin up and say, in Pennsylvania, we mean what we say.

Why am I so imbued by that? I feel

ennobled by the process because as I go to the pardons board month after month I stand up cases that are 10, 20, 30 years old. More older cases. The Commonwealth is still on the case. Why? Is it a matter of budgetary concerns? Is it a matter of the cost per annum per prisoner? Is it a matter of the penalogical interest of the prisoner/management situation of the jails? Is it a matter of whether the treatment model works? What's the right for the reformation of a person? What about the rehabilitation concept on the street? No, for me it's much more important than that. For me, it's a covenant, it's a promise, it's a social contract alive and well that when somebody asks me, what does life mean, I can say in Pennsylvania life means life. And I go on to explain that there are certain situations that may emerge in the future where a person's circumstances, unforeseeably changed, drenched with unforeseeable merit, may warrant that the Governor himself, the sovereign, if you will, of our State would step in and say, with the approval of the Board of Pardons, you shall go free. To me, this ennobles the victim of the murder, even however humble he may have been.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If you have 500 homicides in Philadelphia, for example, it may be argued that many

people in a high risk lifestyle, engaging in things they shouldn't have been doing, got killed may have assumed the risk, might have earned it, people might say. I say, however, that if you do it for the least of these, it's the most important standard that we have as fellows in our society living out our social contract with one another, so that no matter if the man was a street person, if he was involved in drug dealing, if he was a person that we might regard as the leper, if you will, yet he is as important as the person of greatest stature in our society under our law, and later on I can go before the board or I can tell the surviving kin or I can tell the jury in the hallway afterwards, here we mean what we say. We really mean what we say.

I would ask you not to allow that word to be depreciated, that word "life," and to allow for the constitutional set-up to remain in place. Here, no matter how humble that victim may have been, here and perhaps here almost alone in the whole 50 States the Governor, the chief executive officer, the sovereign, if you will, of our State will pass on whether or not that covenant shall now be sundered because of the merit of the applicant, because of the change in defense, because it is equitable, fair, and decent to

1 do so.

I thank you for your time.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Mr. Chairman, if I

may.

MR. COLIHAN: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: You made a statement about the Governor's right to commute and I agree with you theoretically, you know, that should be a fair approach. My problems have been in reviewing the records of our governors is that they have been making decisions based on politics, not based on the facts, because again, that is my concern. I'm more concerned about the fact that prior to their second election they do not see fit to commute someone and right after that it's fitting. Now, I'm just saying, what is the difference except the election process that makes that Governor make those kinds of decisions? Do you think that is fair?

MR. COLIHAN: I think that in the second term of Governor Shapp there was a virtual scandal that caused perhaps numerous chief executives subsequent to that time to perhaps restrain from doing that which might be fair and equitable. There you had 317 life sentence prisoners commuted in his second term and the first term was a wasteland for the commutation process.

Why? I agree with you, Representative Carn, there are definitely political overtones, but the redemption here is that politics is the art of the possible, it is a greeting between those who are elected to serve and those who put them there. It is a way of assessing and determining and acting out the general will of the body politic. In that sense, politics is good. And in this sense it is if the chief executive reads the politic to be unwise to release life sentenced prisoners, then so be it, it is the process, it is the system.

However, we could jump the current system or at least create a collateral system under this bill and become maybe in time where we have buried the accountability deeply in the recesses and the bowels of an administrative organ, we could perhaps become more like our sister States - New York, California - places where serial killers abound. Why? Because the treatment and rehabilitative model has been exalted. Over all of these other values now there is a dangerous leakage of very toxic mentalities into society coming from the prisons and the failed treatment system. I like the political system if this is the result that we have achieved in Pennsylvania. It seems to me we have achieved it. Occasionally we have our mass murderers, we have our Marty Grahams occasionally, but we don't

seem as a State to be afflicted with the Hillside
Strangler types, with the ravaging of homeless and
destitute people on the streets of New York as they
have over there. It's bad.

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When I read about a crime, for example, Representative Carn, forgive me for taking an extra Four teenage girls shot and killed in a tofu or a yogurt store in Austin, Texas, I lose sleep over those crimes that happened in Austin, Texas or other places, they distract me so. I feel injured by them and I can't do anything about them. But as in the case I have on trial now, when I heard that a marine, on his way to the Persian Gulf, was shot in the back four times, and it happened at 62nd and Callowhill, in my neighborhood, or near where I live, I didn't feel that bad about the helplessness and the futility of it. This is a strange thing to say, perhaps, but why? Because I felt here I might have a hand in doing something to make something a little bit better come out of a horrible evil. So instead of a yellow ribbon and 21 guns, I'll do the best I can to make sure that the man who took his life this coming Monday or Tuesday comes right into this building, maybe to be transferred to Rockview to await his turn on the row or maybe to spend the rest of his life here. There will be, in my

estimation of the dynamics of what's going on in that case right now, nothing will ever extinguish the loss that this killer has visited upon our society by the death of one of our brothers in society. Nothing will ever fill the cup of justice. There is a semblance of it with a life sentence.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: But again, with our present system, still the Governor has, under our Constitution, the right to commute that person's sentence sometime whenever the Governor feels it is apropos.

MR. COLIHAN: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: But again, the Governor is listening to his advisors. It's not as if he is making or deciding whether or not this person should be commuted, it is others who are advising him.

Now, my only point in raising that is if his advisors, and he has yet, no Governor, from what I've read, has commuted anyone that he wasn't advised to commute, from my own investigation. So why make it a political decision if that has been the history of commutation? Why put the Governor in a position where he has to make a political decision when his own advisors, who he put there, advise him that this person is not a threat to society and should be given

consideration for commutation? How do you respond to that?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. COLIHAN: Well, initially, I would almost reflexively think of the accountability aspect of it, and I concede that there may be more venal people who would do things for less worthy motives, even to deny a man his freedom where he's earned it or where the murderer is there and where the unforeseeable circumstances have arisen such that he ought to be commuted. If he were to be denied that, that would be a wrong. That would be a wrong. There are places and times for commutation. But to put it down, if I may say, in the scale of the treatment model or the rehabilitation order, public confidence would be far greater in the wisdom of the chief executive than it would be in the instruments of government below the Governor's Office, or below the legislative level.

For example, I don't know that a lot of people trust all the DAs in the world. Maybe when I go into a courtroom perhaps people think I'm selling them down the river. Maybe I've made a plea bargain. Is there going to be a plea bargain, people ask me? People don't know. I'm to them a bureaucrat and I may very well be just that. But at least in terms of accountability, the Governor's got it. Maybe I don't

have quite so much of it. Maybe the people on the Board of Probation and Parole don't have much of it either. Maybe. I don't know.

I grabbed a guy in my back yard four or five weeks ago and while I held him for the 25 minutes waiting for the police to arrive I asked him his name and et cetera, and I got some duplicatious answers. And by the time I finally got to run a record check on him, I found out that during the 25 minutes that I'm supervising him by the collar he's under the concurrent supervision of the Board of Probation and Parole and three different courts of Common Pleas judges, but I was the one that was closest to him. I got to supervise him for that 25 minutes.

I don't think a lot of people have a lot of confidence in the instruments of public safety and order. I do believe that the Governor at least stands at that point where he may be removed if the consensus of the people in the collective wisdom thinks he ought to be removed, and those of us who disagree with him from time to time on this or that will have to live with it.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. COLIHAN: Thank you, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. WILLIAMSON: First of all, I want to speak as a victim. I'm a victim of a husband killed in 1969 and left four children to raise. I'm also the victim of a murder in August 1990 where a nephew was killed. This hostility and anger, I had it. me, I'm no superwoman. But we got to get beyond that and get to a healing process and to a forgiving process, because once we are in that mode of anger and unforgiving, we make our own selves sick. Mr. Colihan and I have quite an argument over this all the time. I'm not a novice at telling people how I feel. I do believe people change. Twenty years ago if you asked me if I would be sitting here today speaking for House Bill 1382 I would have said, hell, no, you think I'm crazy? But I find out that I'm not crazy. I have four children, none of them in the system. They are all productive citizens and they all have a high education, so it can be done.

The young lady spoke of her daughter on welfare. Well, you don't have to go on welfare either. We got more people on welfare where the people in the system, where the victim was killed. So I have been there and I plead with you people today to consider this. I hate paying my taxes to take care of people without them being productive citizens. The man that

killed my husband, his best punishment would have been to let him stay in jail at night, work in the daytime, turn his paycheck over to my family, pay taxes to the State, and then he would have been punished. You don't punish a man by--

REPRESENTATIVE REBER: You would probably have Mr. Colihan supervising.

MS. WILLIAMSON: That's right. And Mr. Colihan, I'm glad--

REPRESENTATIVE REBER: Unfortunately, there's not a lot of those around, are there, Mr. Coliban?

MS. WILLIAMSON: I'm glad you have a perfect DA system, because I want to know what happened to the policeman that shot Pauline Velasquez's son? He also did something wrong. Maybe he shot him accidentally, but also Bruce Bainbridge shot someone accidentally.

Secondly, Barbara Christ and the Charles
Diggs case, Barbara Christ did not even know where
Broad and Susquehanna was. She thought it was in
Germantown. So she has a right to new trial because
you only picked the people who she thought was in her
favor because she figured these people in Germantown
would be afraid of Charles Diggs. I was at the Federal

hearing and I testified. And I told her that Broad and Susquehanna was in north Philadelphia, and she asked me how did I know?

Elizabeth Chambers knows that, and I told her the boundaries of the city, what is north, south east and west. So you don't have a perfect DA system. So there's a lot, none of us, not one of us that sit in this room has not made a mistake, and because of the fallibility of the system it is a reason to have a House Bill 1382.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yes, were there any further comments?

MS. WILLIAMSON: I'm finished.

MR. JACOBS: I would like to respond to something that the DA said, and first of all, this is the DA that handled my case. I have a lot of respect for him because I know he was doing his job, and it's important that we understand that. We are here for what we believe in, and I think that's also important too, as well as the victim.

But on the day that this crime was committed by myself, I was also a victim of my own ignorance. There was a victim who lost his life in north Philadelphia, Charles Savoski. Charles Savoski had a right to life. He had a right to run his

business. He had the right to be the breadwinner of his family. But unfortunately, some young man who was ignorant entered into his store and tried to rob him, and in the process of that, Charles Savoski pulled out a gun in defense of his right to have a business, and foolishly and so ignorantly we took his life. When I'm saying "we," I am not the shooter. Let me attest to that. I was the co-contributor, but I was guilty because I agreed to enter his store on the enterprise of robbing him. So I recognize that equal quilt and not try to separate myself from that guilt. But it was unfortunate that I was ignorant to enter a grocery store where there was no more than \$30 or \$40 at the most when I could have went into the First National Bank with some intelligence and maybe robbed them for a little more. So I was ignorant and I was a victim of my own ignorance.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Socrates, whose student was Plato, constructed a doctrine that we as human beings all have the ability to do right. We all have that ability, each and every one of us. We have that ability. But until the rational capacities are developed in all human beings to do right, then there are going to continue to be human beings that do wrong.

Now, the system comes out with the

eloquence of the species, the dynamics. I mean, they're phenomenal if you walk into the courtroom. Anthony Jacobs sat in the courtroom 20 years old. I had a DA there that probably was a Harvard graduate. I was a graduate of Daniel Boone. I had a jury in there that was from the northeast. It doesn't matter whether they were black or white. That was never my argument, okay? But I was in a process that I didn't understand, and I became even another victim.

And there's another victim who's called the other side of crime, which is another process, that says that you enter into a prison system and that Anthony Jacobs' life should be written off without a possibility of consideration. So that means that everybody in here, you spoke about parole. He apprehended a guy in his back yard. Yes, that guy was paroled, he was on probation. But the record clearly shows that lifers who have been released represent less then 1 percent of the recidivism of people coming back into this penitentiary. So again, we have to be clear when we define what the problem is. The problem is not lifers.

First of all, I would not release all the lifers in this jail if I was the Governor. I would not release the 2,200 men that are in the system. It would

be foolish to say that. House Bill 1382 doesn't say release lifers. It says create a process so that we can have a better monitorization of the men who are serving life and that they receive parole eligibility, not parole. But parole consideration, not parole. That's a difference. The process was started through William Penn. The King gave William Penn the authority to pardon. Everything has two crimes - crimes committed against the King and treason. So the process of pardon was created long before Governor Thornburgh, Shapp, and Mr. Colihan and myself. So the process of pardon was also a theory within those people who made decisions.

If your son was incarcerated, would you not seek every opportunity to free him? If your daughter was incarcerated for murder, would you not, as a parent and a responsible human being, seek to have your daughter or your son released at such a time that his rational or her rational capacity could prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that there is a minimum chance that they would re-enact the crime that they committed? That's what our system is all about. A system without hope and without mercy and without consideration is no system at all. America cannot continue on to be as callous as we say our evil empire

is, or Russia or Iran or Iraq. We keep saying how callous they is when they cut off hands, they cut off necks. But how can we continue to be so callous to say that a human being who has not the rational capacity at 14 years old; 14 years old. This kid was 14 years old. He walked into a store and he turned back and he shot. Now he's 35. Is he still the same individual? And if he is, keep him in jail. I am in total agreement with that. But if he has changed emotionally and psychologically and rationally, shouldn't we consider it? I mean, not give it to him but consider him with fairness. No politics, no money involved.

And talk about money, let's talk about money. I did 23 years as an accessory to murder because I didn't have money. The judge's son, Herbert Kane's son did 12 years for the same crime. What made him different than me? From a Governor who said he wants all the lifers to do 25 years, what made him different than me? And then his father turned right back around and got busted for a crime himself. But the only difference between him and me, he's playing golf, and I'm walking through Graterford playing a life and death game. That made the difference. So don't give me this bullshit about what's equity and what's fairness, because there's no such thing. It's not a

black and white situation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You people are charged with a responsibility based on your intellect, based on the intellect of your learning and your schooling. You didn't follow my road, and I'm glad you didn't, but I don't take anything from you. I respect you. respect him. It's his job. If I was a DA, I would do the same thing he's doing. I respected him when he went to trial, when he went to my commutation hearing and said don't release him, because had they released me then, maybe I would have went out there and got into all this stuff. But I can lay forth the record and show you that I have done more in my year of release than some of you folks that have been out here 20 years. What makes the difference? I was the same guy they called animal. I don't have a gun, I don't have a knife, but I have the money to buy a gun, I have the money to buy a knife, but you know what? Something up there is saying, no, you don't want to do that. You never want to place yourself in a system like this where people don't do nothing but talk about you. if you do some good, then they forget about you. always remember the bad, but how many of us really remember the good?

There's two masses of black and white. I

ain't talking about race. The black mass walked into that store. I ain't talking about black man, I'm talking about the quality of darkness. But once I came into the light, shouldn't I have received that kind of consideration? That's what my argument is. It's not based on politics and who's right and who's wrong, who's up and who's down.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The courage of the victims' families to come in here to testify and to re-bring forth those emotions, man, that was awesome. It has an effect on all of us. But they were other victims. They will never regain their loved one. They will never do that. And you signing this bill is not going to help the situation one way or the other. Though the process is still going, it will get bogged down in more demagoguery, it will get bogged down in more politics. So no matter what process you do, but one thing we do, we have the right to come forward and lay forth everything. Everybody has a right to be heard. remembered this hearing with Judge Thomas where the chamber said, if you can't hold your comments, then I'll remove you. Because it is not about a boo and applaud thing here. We're talking about human lives. We're talking about people who have lost their lives. This is not a boo or applause situation. This is a

real situation. Savoski was real. He was real until we entered his store. But I'm free now. What can you do about it? Nothing. You can't do nothing about it. The only thing you can hope that the process that released me used everything that was available to them to scrutinize, to sift through my life and to make sure that this process wouldn't happen again. So let's talk about that situation.

That's all I can say.

MR. BLACKBURN: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I want to thank you for the opportunity to say my little part in support of House Bill 1382. I was in the beginning stages of development of this movement for this bill. I was a lifer at Graterford and I was commuted after 14 years, which was truly a blessing in comparison to the time that other men who have been commuted, the time that they served. It is truly a blessing.

To give you a little background of my case, I was not the triggerman. I was involved in the conspiracy, so the court said, but I know deep in my heart I never conspired with anybody to kill this person. The victim in my case, I knew this man all my life. We both were in the drug game, so to speak. We had a disagreement. That lifestyle has a certain

behavior associated with it, and some of it is violent. But when I went to that man, I did not go to him to kill him. I know this in my heart. Whatever the jury said, whatever the court said, in fact they didn't even attempt to prove it in the court. But the conspiracy law is constructed in such a way where they say — the term they use is "implied conspiracy" by the act or you seem to be in some kind of consort within the act, you know.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, I will admit though that my participation in the crime resulted in the man being killed, because as Mr. Colihan so aptly described, sometimes within that mob psychology one person feeds off the heart of someone else. He may not have the courage to do it himself, he may do it because he was with someone else, and I think in my situation that person did feed off the violence that I initiated, but I didn't feel that I should serve a life sentence for my involvement. I agree that I was guilty to a certain extent, but I got the life sentence and my codefendant in the crime, he got 18 months to 10 years, and he was out after 18 months. I'm not saying that to condemn him, that he should have got a life sentence because I don't think he should have, because I know the whole situation involved in his background. I know the

torment that the victim had put him through as far as fear and intimidation, and this was the culmination of that.

б

I will say that my co-defendant's lifestyle since he's been out has shown that he was worthy of that break. He has a business of his own and he's living a lifestyle, he has a nice family and everything, so I wish him well. I don't blame him for the break he got. But I just want to point out that the system is not always perfect, and it took the mercy of a Governor to look at my situation and see that maybe I should not spend the rest of my life in jail. If I had applied maybe four years earlier, I know for a fact I wouldn't have gotten that kind of consideration because the system is filled with politics.

I want to say, we have to understand what goes on in the courtrooms a lot of times. I don't know how Mr. Colihan prosecutes his cases, but I know for a fact that many times in Philadelphia the rights of the accused is violated. I know of instances within my own family where statements are beaten out of people. I know how the police department operates, not always perfect, you know. But I understand that they have a job to do, the district attorney has a job to do, and they pursue their jobs aggressively and sometimes they

have to. But what I'm saying is if you begin with an imperfect system, why when the criminal or the convicted person reaches this level, why all of a sudden does the system become perfect all of a sudden and that the convicted person, just because the system said, which was imperfect to begin with, said that he was incorrigible or that he was brutal that he cannot be considered again?

1

2

3

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I just want to bring your attention to a recent, something that happened recently, I think it was this week. The persons convicted within the Sean Daley crime that was highly publicized, so maybe you might know about that. It was seven Hispanics, five received a life sentence, two got 7 to 20, or something like that. The point I'm making is these men, these young men, I'm not saying that they weren't guilty within their situation. I don't know how many actually participated within that crime, which was horrible. grieve for the family of Sean Daley, you know. fact, I hate mentioning that name, really, because it makes it very personal. But the point I'm trying to make is, these young men, some of them were 16, 17 years old, when they received that life sentence basically what we said was that these people will never, ever again be able to come back and enjoy life

again, that what we said was they are unable to change their lives around. They are incapable of human development, therefore we are going to lock them away forever. Why do we say this? Because we didn't think that we would establish a way that if they did make that development that there would be a mechanism in place to recognize it and they would be considered.

Now, having traveled these hallowed halls for many years, I will be the first to say that there are many here that need not be released. In fact, we should write another law that we put maybe an ex-convict on the Board of Pardons because we know them personally. We lived with them. We can give you a total picture because we have a better insight in that life. But what I'm trying to say is if the system is imperfect, let's establish that check and balance. Let's put that into the situation.

Now, another thing that hasn't been said with regard to 1382 is we're looking at it in a purely negative light, favorable to the prisoner. But in many ways House Bill 1382 establishes a stringent criteria to be followed. We call it the Public Safety and Rehabilitation Act because we understand that the way the politics is within the system, it is possible that the Governor can release a dangerous person, if he has

the right political backing, back into society. With House Bill 1382, we have a stringent criteria established that would require the applicant to go through a very trying process, one that he may not have to go through under a Governor because the Governor's power of commutation is based on this is his decision, or just on maybe the dramatics of a hearing in front of the pardons board.

1

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, I had a few problems with respect to Mr. Colihan. House Bill 1382 would not re-open the We're not talking about re-opening the case. We're talking about establishing a criteria from which you can look at a person to decide if he would be a threat to society again. If he can function within a free society with minimal threat, that he will commit the crime again. Mr. Colihan also said that he felt sorry that a person that was inside here shouldn't be and he can't get out. He said it's pathetic. Why are we going to keep saying it's pathetic if we're not going to do anything about it? We're talking about somebody's life. You know, there are a whole lot of lives involved. You're talking about the life of the victim; that life upstairs is just as important as the life of the victim.

I think the problem we have with our

criminal justice system is that we try to, being that this is the last stage where a person commits a crime, the crime itself is a reflection of the problems that we have in our society. So instead of us acknowledging the blight in our communities, the problem is not within our community. We take the, shall we say the effect of that condition, which is the crime, which is the criminal, and we try to crucify him and thinking that's going to solve the problem. What we need to do is to try to change some of the conditions within the community that breeds this kind of situation.

I know in the neighborhood I grew up in, north Philadelphia, you know, I had certain options as a person, but I knew I had more illegal options than I had legal. We can't say the same thing about in certain suburban communities. A lot of things are not even tolerated there as far as the obvious activity that can go on. And for example, there's a corner in north Philadelphia at Ninth and Indiana, everybody — when I came out on the street I wasn't there two days when I knew what was going on on that corner. It's blatant. The drug selling is blatant. You stop the car at a stop sign, they run to you, what do you want? It's that blatant. Now, I had a suit and a tie on, I could pass for a policeman, I think, under the

circumstances, you know. They didn't know who I was when they run to the car. I haven't been there in 15 years, nobody recognized me. But the point I'm saying is if the problem is that blatant, why does society allow these things to go on? I knew in two days what was going on there, I'm sure the police with their high technology and investigative ability can solve the certain situations.

б

But for some reason or another certain things are allowed to fester, and then we have criminals that come out of that condition and violence that's perpetrated from that condition, and then when that person comes into the courtroom we say, ah, you're the one. It's you. You're the problem. And this is probably a person that can't read or write. This is the only thing he knows. A man that probably goes hungry. Just like Anthony Jacobs, he probably went next door to get some money. This probably was the only option that this man could see, you know.

And the point I'm making is this is the Department of Corrections. This is not a warehouse. I mean, it is a warehouse right now, but the theory is corrections. Let's make it corrections. Mr. Colihan said let's not be contradictory. That's right. Let's make it corrections. And I

know the condition of myself when I came to this place. I needed correcting. Although my involvement may be considered or may not be considered minimal within the crime itself, I know within myself I needed correcting. I know I participated in a process of development in here, and I'm going to tell you, it didn't happen in the treatment department either. It was other men, lifers particularly, who took me under their wing. It's lifers who run the institutions, the nurturing institutions within this institution. The churches, the school. Inmates run the jails. Maybe not here. But this is what happens, and these men that I feel that can come out into the community if given a chance and make that same effect on other lives as it has on mine.

I really admire this brother here because he's a model for any community lifer. He came right out and established himself and he's trying to help other people. I'm trying to hold myself behind him because I think he's a model to follow. But the problem is a lot of the young men in our communities don't have these kind of models to follow. They follow a model that brings them here, and so often than not they continue to follow these negative models. But what I'm saying is there are other men here who deserve

recognition, and we're not saying let all of them out. No, that's not what we're saying. What we're saying is establish a criteria, a mechanism where they can be viewed and on a case-by-case basis, we keep saying case-by-case. This is what we're trying to do, establish a criteria so each man, personal situation can be reviewed, and if he merits it, don't put it in the hand of a political person, put it in the hands of an expert.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Is there a Fletcher Long who is also here? If you would like to come forward. I know you wanted to make a statement also.

MR. LONG: I would like to make a statement. I think this is one of the most moving experiences that I have ever had, Mr. Chairman, board members.

My name is Fletcher Long, and I'm co-editor and publisher of Night Scene Publications in Philadelphia. I have become involved with the prison system for the last 20 years.

My involvement, I have a problem with the prosecutor, not because he's a prosecutor but because he does a job and he sit there and he said they tried cases 25 and 30 years ago and he represents the

Commonwealth. It's all well and good, you got a job. 46 years ago, at the age of 19, I'm 65 now, I had a prosecutor tell me the same thing in Birmingham, Alabama. I was in the service. He said, "Boy, I got to get you convicted." So they took me and they tried me on 10 charges of burglary and grand larceny. first case, the defense, which was a court-appointed attorney, now he messed up so bad I said, "Mister, you sit down because I'll be in the chair." I made the court look so bad that the judge said, "Stop it here." He said, "I'll tell you what, sir, you're guilty." I said, "If I'm guilty, what else can I do?" He said, "Well, sit down over there, Boy." This was in Birmingham, Alabama. I never will forget it, and this is the reason I have to reflect this. He said, "You sit down." He said, "I'm finding you guilty in the first case. How do you find the rest?" The prosecutor got up, he said, "Wait a minute. We're going to now pros those other five cases and just take the nigger on the other five cases." And so I said, "Well, Your Honor, but wait a minute." He said, "Wait a minute, this is my courtroom." The prosecutor said, "I got to do my job."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So it ended up they give me 5 years in the first case, 6 in the second, 7 in the next, 8 in the next, and 10 in the last case. A total of 36 years. That was a life sentence. I was 19 years old. And when I went to go down the hallway, the prosecutor was walking along with this nice white lady and her daughter. I said, "Excuse me, Miss, I want to shake this boy's hand," he said, "because he really got some merits for me today." And the lady looked at me, she said, "Mister, you're a young man about the age of my son." She said, "I feel so bad for you," she said, "because I wouldn't give a dog that kind of time."

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So I went into the penitentiary at 19 years old. I had to do 10 years before I got paroled, but even in Alabama they do get a chance to get paroled. Life system there is 15 years and you get a I don't care who you kill or who you shot. And never get it in your mind that I'm a liberal or bleeding heart. I'm not. I've been in the system here helping. I helped raise that young fellow there. And my point that I'm getting, over two years I have, since I've been in Philadelphia, I've been shot up, I've been stuck up, I was mistaken for being white because I was driving my wife and they thought I was a white boy with this nigger woman. And I was assaulted, shot at, I've been stuck up with guns in my face. My son was murdered in the streets 10 years ago in Philadelphia.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

But you know what, I still come behind these walls.

But the system stinks. It's good people like you that can change it. Here's a gentleman here, and I was in Harrisburg the day that he won an appeal for commutation of sentence. He jumped up and he says, "Look, don't let Stephen Blackburn out. He's a hardened criminal." And he can tell you right there what Attorney General Preate jumped up and said, wait a minute. You mean to tell me that this man has did 14 years and he wasn't the shooter and the shooter is walking the street after 18 months and you mean to tell me that that's justice? He said, that can't be no justice. He said this man should have been in the He should have never been in the jail for 14 years. And it's a shame.

If you don't help pass this bill, you're going to have many more people that's in here for 15, 20, 30, and 40 years. My son is dead, and both of them got life sentences, and there's nobody that's any more hurt than I am about my boy that's dead. There's somewhere up here, this brother here can testify, I bring children into the prisons and one night I was standing in the middle of the floor and I recognize this guy standing next to me. Omar said to me, he said, what's wrong, Mr. Fletcher, is there a problem?

I said, just get him away from me. I said, veah. The brothers surrounded me and they got this individual away from me. He didn't even know who I was. understand my point? But as the years and the months go by, I have sort of softened. I said, well, I hope that they can live those 15, 20, 30 years and suffer like I suffered for the last 10 years that I lost my baby, gunned down in the streets of Philadelphia, and the system still permits, as you said at Ninth and Indiana, I can take you to any corner in Philadelphia and show the drugs running rampant, and the system does nothing about it. And they are worse off than anything that we can sit here in this room today and talk about.

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You people here have a chance to solve a problem. The problem is the system. You're part of the system. I beg you to help them.

MR. COLIHAN: Mr. Chairman, may I very briefly comment on the remarks of Mr. Fletcher and other ideas that might be harbored here about what my job is.

When I stood at the gravesite of my cousin who was murdered and when I read in the newspapers about the death of a relative in prison awaiting execution, when they were still executing people in Pennsylvania, and today when I hold my

grandchild in my arms or when I go to work, it's all part of the same fabric. I am not a mouthpiece for the District Attorney's Office, as might be a convenient way to dispose of my remarks. I am not an organ of a I am simply expressing the perspective of politician. the prosecutor who does not go to court like unto a David Duke or what happened in Birmingham in 1950. go to court not as a demographic expert, because I represent the underdogs of the society of Philadelphia. Those least of people. Most of the people that I as a prosecutor and most prosecutors represent are people who are truly voiceless, that they are silenced by murder or nobody cares about their crimes. I have seen racism in the court system. I have seen crime indulged because what's it got to do with life in Margate, after all? I've seen that. That is my, if you will, my clientele is the underdog. I must say I disbristle a little bit of comparisons with Bull Connor or whatever reference might have been being made. I don't have that cloth or that fabric in my cloth, and I'm not unlike most of the prosecutors that I know.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you for allowing me to say that.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Are there any other comments or questions?

MR. JACOBS: Okay, I wanted to basically

lay out a little scenario here. At the age of 5, I was at the Youth Study Center, okay, and it was for placement. Okay, what I thought was a simple placement turned out to be into a foster home, okay, because my father was killed in the Korean War, and I will try to make the story very short, and from that time on I grew up in north Philly and I involved myself in a street gang and I told the psychiatrist one time we wasn't do-gooders, so we went out and we did our little thing in society. Now today what we did the kids would make it look like it was child's play.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I went through the system, okay? I continued to be a delinquent. I had 18 juvenile arrests before I was 16 years old. Okay, I'm talking about the moment of impact. I didn't know that my mother had placed me in the Youth Study Center at the age of 5 for sexually molesting my younger sister. Now, I didn't understand what that meant. I do now as an adult. I have the opportunity to teach college, you know. I taught at Penn, I taught at Bloomsburg University. I helped people throughout the system get their GEDs and also to apply for their SATs and make them eligible for the rehabilitative process, but as a young man I didn't have much education. I came in the system with only a sixth grade education. I had a

diploma, I had a college degree in streetology, but not in education, not a secondary education in my ABCs.

I then went to Glenn Mills, which was '62, I asked the judge to go to Glenn Mills, and one of the reasons that I wanted to go to Glenn Mills was that a friend of mine in the neighborhood said, you think you're tough? If you ever go to Glenn Mills, somebody is going to make something other than what you really are. You understand what I'm saying? So I went to Glenn Mills with this thing that I want to be tough. I asked the judge to go to Glenn Mills. The judge then sent me to Glenn Mills. I asked the judge to go to Glenn Mills. That's the school for delinquents.

I did 18 months there and I proved that I was tough because I was considered running the place, okay? So they said, no, you can't run our place, we're going to ship you out. So I went to the Creek, which is a house of corrections, at 16 years old. The next time I was sent to Camp Hill, which was Whitehill then, which was an industrial school for young boys. Okay. I did four years there. Four years. At 16 years old I walked into Whitehill Industrial School for Boys. For the whole four years I did not go to school. Now, you tell me what system, what process would permit a young man, a young kid, 16 years old not to go to school?

I stayed there for four years and all I did was talk about how I was going to go out and we were going to rob people, how we were going to create more havoc or whatever we can do in the community when we get out. How we were going to be bigger jitterbugs.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Three months after I was released from Camp Hill, or Whitehill at the time, I committed this crime. And at that point I did 23 years. I applied for commutation since 1979. It wasn't an easy process. I was transferred to Muncy. I was here at Graterford, too, and when I was here at Graterford they considered me one of the tough guys here. If I was not the tough guy, I was one of the tough guys. And I did a lot of negative stuff. The social ills that brought me to jail I continued on with. I mean, this period of rehabilitation is a bunch of junk. Somehow I believe that you have the picture that once a person is arrested he comes to jail, gets a Bible, gets a Koran, he gets a Torah and he's back in religion, he's back in education, he's back in whatever. That's not true. lot of young lifers that come to jail become major problems in the system. Now it's based on the support systems that are in that system determines whether or how this person is going to wind up years later.

In my first nine years I had

approximately 20 write-ups. Only had 23 all together. I had 20 write-ups, which was sound. I was a bad guy, I was ugly, I was incorrigible and I was put in the system. Anthony Jacobs deserved to be in that system. If I was a judge and the young kid came before me that had my track record as Anthony Jacobs, I would say to you, send him away. And I went away, and for 9 years I got 20 some write-ups. For the next 13 or 14 years I only received 3 misconducts, and most of them was minor. The DA in the case in one of my hearings mentioned that to convince the panel of the Attorney 12 General, Lieutenant Governor, the psychologist, the 13 criminologist there and also the penologist, they said 14 that Anthony Jacobs should not be released. And they 15 said why? They said because he sexually molested his 16 young sister. Now, remember, I was placed in the 17 system at the age of 5.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So what I did, I wrote Arlen Specter, because I know his wife, Joan Specter, and I know some sensitivity would be involved with this, so I wrote him because I had the skills to articulate. I developed --I went to school, I woke up, I said, I better go to college and try to get some education. There was no hopes of getting out, there was no manipulation of the system, didn't have to because I was the greatest of

all manipulators. I didn't have to worry about nothing. Anything that I wanted was at my beck and call, you know.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There was a time that they said I was the Commissioner of the Bureau of Corrections in all of the jails. Not just one, all of them, okay? And the record bears forward. You got guards here that know me, okay, they know who I was, and some guards here that say, man, you're a miracle. But the point is that no matter how negative you is, there's a possibility, a hope that you may see the light some day. And that's what the Governor freed me on. He didn't free me on the 23 write-ups I got, he freed me on the time after that nine-year period had taken place; he looked at me. But it was a political system. Had not Chuck Stone took up my case and had not Gina Bullion of the Philadelphia Daily News taken up my case, and had not Kendall Wilson of the Philadelphia Tribune took up my case and argued my case and challenged the Board of Pardons, I wouldn't be home today. No one said release him because he had merit.

This man here opposed me bitterly. I mean, I respect him. Then he went in there one day and he said, well, the Commonwealth don't oppose. But it became a sword fighting thing between me and him, and I

always wondered what he looked like. Now I'm here sitting beside him. I said, man if I get that guy I'm going to choke him. You know. I'm just saying that these are the feelings you have. They are real feelings.

But the point I'm trying to make and I'm trying to express to you is that Anthony Jacobs was released on November 5th, and being released, I wanted to show you what I did. I went to, I applied for a job at Sleighton Schools, and that's where the juvenile delinquents and dependent youth are. It's a coeducational facility. And in three months I was promoted to a Counselor II, and I am now on the weekend ground supervisor of a 320-student facility. But had I not been released, this would not have been possible. Had I still been that animal that I was at 20 years old, this wouldn't have been possible. It wouldn't have been possible.

I coordinate a staff of 300. I coordinate them. And my education is probably far more better than theirs are because it is a legitimate education. I have a GED. You need 225 points to pass a GED. It's not like a diploma where you get credits for gym, you get credits for going to art class, you get credits for this. And the GED system is a far more

better, sound system for education. They have proven that people who fail the GED system are twice as intelligent as those who get a diploma. This is a survey that was put out. I'm talking facts.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I go to the school, I tell them that I'm from the penitentiary, I've been there. I try to keep these young kids from coming to where I was at. These process or systems are no more than incubators for young kids to sit there and talk about their little crime theaters and to go out and become better crime participators. And I'm trying to put Donald Vaughn out of business. I'm trying to put the Department of Corrections out of business by working with these young kids. It's a hard process, especially when the role models in their community are so negative. They're so negative. But the only way they have a chance for the apple pie or the American dream is through drugs. The The guy that just went on the roof top and only way. killed someone for a chain, I mean, took two lives for a chain. Just senselessly went up with a semi-automatic rifle and shot two people down over a gold chain. Can you imagine? How many of you all got gold chains on? If you do, do not go down by 15th and Dixon because you will get gunned down.

Crime don't stop. We've got to figure

out something, some way that we can help our society. But we also got to be sensitive and we also must have the understanding that those people who go astray in our society, is there some way that we maybe can probably look at that person in a period of time, not as soon as they get in there because I'll tell you, if you would have asked me was I sorry for Charles Savoski five years after I was incarcerated, I would have told you no. No. He shouldn't have been in my way. I didn't kill him, but that was the attitude. I'm only playing out the trauma of circumstances that affected my life, that impacted my life.

But once that impact was lifted and once that support system you have called Corrections, like vocational training. I'm an electrician. I got the skills at the Graterford. I went over, I was in the projection booth, I went all around. I was up in Muncy with the women. I was one of five lifers in an all-female facility. There was only five men there. Can you imagine, after being incarcerated for X amount of years, being put up there with 900 females? Can you imagine? I mean, it was like a picnic. But I went up there with a mission. I knew that if I got one of the women pregnant, I was out of there. I knew if I was disrespectful toward the staff I was out of there.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I went there to a point where the superintendent opposed me coming there because he felt as though I was too political. I was involved with too many organizations. So getting involved with a lot of organizations and a lot of other stuff can have you excluded, but this same woman, after she ran out of denial she allowed me to come to Muncy, and they told the staff there, a guard from Huntingdon came up there to visit and he was on a tour and he seen me and he whispered to one of the females there, he said, watch that man. He is dangerous. He is one of the most dangerous men in the system. So they all got their little guns together, they was trying to shoot me down, but the only thing Anthony Jacobs had was I had a purpose and I had a mission, and I was determined that if I made a mistake it would be a mistake knowingly and intelligently, that it would never be a mistake because I was ignorant. I would never be victimized again by my own ignorance of the law.

And I have developed an appreciation of the law. I am now a member of NABCJ, which is the National Association of Blacks in Criminal justice. Probably the only fellow ex-offender that's a member of the organization in Pennsylvania. I am a member of the CEA, the Correctional Educational Association. I'm

also, I raise money for the United Negro College Fund of Pennsylvania for NABCJ, the NABCJ branch. I did Walk America with New Jersey Bell and Bell of Pennsylvania. I have walked something like 12 miles. Just walked. I mean, I could have been out there dealing drugs, shuffling or robbing another grocery store, but the same man that walked in was not the same man that walked out. The boy that walked in became the man that walked out.

And I believe in the transformation. God has created all of us, and I hate to leave God out of this, but we all profess to be Christians. I mean, it's so easy to say that we're Christians, it's so easy for us to say we're Muslims, it's easy to say that we're Jews, but if you lay down the book of the Muslims, you lay down the book of the Christians, you lay down the book of the Christians, you lay down the book of the Jews, each one of them books says that you have a responsibility of self and you also have responsibility of your fellow man and that you should be forgiven. You should forget. And you should help your fellow man.

Why are there doctors? Why are there doctors? If there was no doctors, we would get sick, there would be no one that could mend our sickness.

That's our physical sickness. What about those people

who are emotionally sick? What about those people?
You are the doctors. When he goes to court he
represents the doctor side of the Commonwealth. I
don't hate him. I respect him. I wish I had his job.
Probably be making more money. I only make \$23,000
right now, but I respect him.

I do seminars in Philadelphia. It's called Crime and Correction. Had I not been released, I wouldn't be able to do these seminars. I am a volunteer at the Youth Study Center. Had I not been released, I wouldn't be there. I wouldn't be there now. I am involved with an Olney section on Super Saturday. It's a big event up there. They invited me to come and speak. I just spoke. I'm a member of the OAR program, the Fitness, Aid and Respiration. I was invited there to speak to the chiefs of the probation and the parole. I was the guest speaker of this program. The keynote speaker was our illustrious mayor, Wilson Goode.

So it shows you what I looked like when I came in as opposed to what I was when I went out. What you've seen that came in was the caterpillar. What you seen what went out was the butterfly. And all we're asking you to do is identify the butterflies in the system. If no one deserved to be out, good, keep them

the hell in. I would be in total agreement and I would help you bolt the doors. But if someone deserves to be out, allow it to be done. There's too many discrepancies and disparities in the system, and we all know it. We can look up in the sky and turn our heads around and all that type stuff, we all know that, but I also know that if your son was here, you, too, would want to seek some fairness for him. You may want to keep him from people like me, you may want to keep him from people like him, but really, we're all doing our job based on what information we receive, the impact of our lives. It's not about abuse, it's not about prejudice, it's not about all that stuff. And I hate to come on TV because people on the subway will be looking at me all day long. There's people out on my job saying, he's an ex-inmate. I love it. Yes, I'm an ex-inmate and I'm doing better than you. You ain't doing nothing. You're not a role model.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Those kids up there need help - black white, Hispanic - they need help, and eventually they're going to build a system where you're going to have to make a decision. Whether you pass House Bill 1382, I could care less, but I did come here to make my case known that I was a lifer, I was a murderer, but I'm home now and I'm living a good life. I'm living an

upright life, and if I choose to make a mistake later on, judge me based on my merits and judge me based on that mistake, but judge me. Don't judge all men, because we're not equal. All women are not equal. We're different. We come from diversified backgrounds.

So I'm asking you, wherever you go,
Pittsburgh or Muncy, wherever you go, whether the
speakers are good, bad, whether the victims come here
and cry, whether the lifers come here and cry, don't
base it on that, base it on the need to really look at
the system. Whether you change it or not, just look at
the system and if you see any flaws, change them. If
you don't see any flaws, leave it alone, but at least
look. Take the sunglasses off and look.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We'll adjourn the hearing, and I do want to thank everybody that participated today. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded at 2:30 p.m.)

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me during the hearing of the within cause, and that this is a true and correct transcript of the same. Un Marie ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR SUPERVISION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER. Ann-Marie P. Sweeney 3606 Horsham Drive Mechanicsburg, PA 17055 717-732-5316