	1.
1	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
2	COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
3	In re: Oversight Hearing of Board of Pardons
4	* * * *
5	Stenographic report of hearing held in Room 140, Majority Caucus Room,
6	Main Capitol Building, Harrisburg, PA
7	Thursday,
8	February 18, 1993 10:00 a.m.
9	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
1.0	HON. THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, CHAIRMAN
11	MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON HIDIOTARY
12	MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
13	Hon. Michael Gruitza Hon. Kathy Manderino Hon. Harold James Hon. Al Masland
14	Hon. Frank LaGrotta Hon. Robert Reber
15	Alas Bussants
16	Also Present:
17	David Krantz, Executive Director Galina Milahov, Research Analyst Paul Dynklohomen Populisan Becomeh Analyst
18	Paul Dunkleberger, Republican Research Analyst
19	Donautad to
20	Reported by: Ann-Marie P. Sweeney, Reporter
21	
22	
23	ANN-MARIE P. SWEENEY
24	3606 Horsham Drive Mechanicsburg, PA 17055 717-732-5316



		2
1	INDEX	
2	·	PAGE
3	John Lord, Secretary, Board of Pardons	3
4	Jean Buffington, Staff, Board of Pardons	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10 -		
11		
12		
13		•
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: This will be dealing with the Board of Pardons. And whenever you want to start.

MR. LORD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is Jean Buffington of our staff.

MS. BUFFINGTON: Pleased to meet you.

MR. LORD: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, thank you for asking me here today. I'm pleased to share with you some of the duties and responsibilities of the Board of Pardons.

The membership of the board is specified in Article IV, Section 9, of the Pennsylvania Constitution. The Lieutenant Governor serves as chairman, and the Attorney General is a member. Three other members are appointed by the Governor, subject to Senate confirmation. One must be a member of the Bar, one must be a penologist, and one must be a medical doctor, a psychiatrist or psychologist.

Prior to the Constitution of 1874, the

Governor had exclusive pardoning power. From 1874 to

the enactment of the 1967 Constitution, any pardon

issued by the Governor first needed to be recommended

by at least three members of the Pardons Board, which

included the Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General,

Secretary of the Commonwealth, and Secretary of

Internal Affairs. Today, at least three of the five board members must vote in favor of an application for it to be recommended to the Governor.

The board can recommend clemency in five ways: They can recommend that a death sentence be commuted to life imprisonment; they can recommend that a life sentence be commuted to a prescribed minimum sentence; they can recommend that a maximum sentence be commuted or a minimum sentence be commuted; and they can recommend a pardon.

The majority of applications we receive are either for commutation of a life sentence or for a pardon. The entire process from the time an applicant files to the time when it is either granted or denied by the Governor usually takes about 10 to 14 months.

applicant must file an official application which they can get from us for \$4. Once it is received by us with a \$20 filing fee, the application is reviewed by our staff to insure that all questions have been answered. Copies are sent to the Board of Probation and Parole, sentencing judge, and to the district attorney in the county where the crime was committed. When an applicant is incarcerated, we also send the Department of Corrections a copy of his application.

•

The Board of Probation and Parole conducts a background investigation on the applicant, which takes about three to four months. During this time we usually receive comments back from the sentencing court and from the district attorney. Once all the necessary information is received, the case is listed for merit review by members of the board. If two of the five board members vote to hear a case, it will be listed in the next month's calendar for a hearing. About half the applications are approved for a hearing. Our office will then notify the victim or the victim's family of the hearing. Victims are invited to either attend or are offered an opportunity to place written comments into the record.

At the hearing, the applicant or the applicant's authorized representative offers reasons why clemency should be recommended. After the presentation and questions from the board members, the district attorney and the victim or the victim's family are given an opportunity to present their views on the case. And the board votes in public session. If the applicant receives the necessary three votes, it is recommended to the Governor. The Governor is not required to act on the recommendation within a given time period; however, most cases were returned to us

about six months after they are sent to the Governor's Office.

Board of Pardons, it's important to know that we hear a broad range of cases. We get everything from retail theft to first-degree murder. In each case, the board members take the responsibility very seriously. The members take the time to thoroughly review all aspects of the case. Some of the factors they consider include the facts of crime, the original sentence imposed, the degree of demonstrated remorse, the likelihood of the crime being repeated, and the positions of the court and the district attorney, as well as the victim.

If the applicant is currently in prison, the board also considers a position of the institutional staff and of the Commissioner of Corrections. Incarcerated applicants are not permitted to appear before the board, and they are provided with a representative from the Department of Corrections.

Nonincarcerated applicants are required to appear.

There is one problem which I would like to share with the Judiciary Committee. We are getting an increasing number of applications for multiple driving violations. Many of these cases involve violations which are over 10 years old and were

committed when the applicant was a teenager or in his carly 20s. I've seen cases where the violations have piled up to where the driver's license has been suspended to the year 2007, the year 2011, and the year 2014. Many of the driving violation applicants seem to have turned their lives around and seem to be descrying of a hearing, but the board is reluctant to hear such cases because of the numbers of suspended licenses and because the Board of Pardons does not seem to be the correct agency for review of traffic violations. It is the position of the Board of Pardons that clemency from the Governor requiring his personal attention and his direct action is not appropriate for most suspended license cases. Also, the cost for processing driving cases far exceeds any other type of clemency application received, including commutation of a life sentence. Because habitual driving offenders usually have violations in numerous municipalities and often in different counties, we must initiate contact with many more courts and district attorneys than with other cases.

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

Also, the Board of Probation and Parole, which is already overburdened in at least one county, must conduct a complete background investigation into these cases. In the report they must include

information on employment, education, family history, as well as findings in the applicant's community reputation and financial situation. This work is costly and time-consuming.

The members of the board sympathize with people who have suffered great hardships because they have lost driving privileges. We have received applications from family wage carners who are about to lose their jobs and their homes because they need to drive for employment. One distraught applicant I spoke with mentioned suicide as his only option after he was denied a hearing.

Long-term license suspensions are a serious problem for many Pennsylvanians. The Department of Transportation has drafted legislation which will provide a process to review long-term suspensions and to allow PennDOT to issue probationary licenses. This legislation will make a real difference in the lives of hundreds of Pennsylvanians, and the Board of Pardons supports such a move and hopes that a speedy action will be taken on the issue.

Another area which I understand the members of the Judiciary Committee are concerned is the battered women's syndrome. Lieutenant Governor Singel wants me to convey to you his deep concern on this

of Pardons is open to any ideas you might have concerning our role in bringing justice to this unique class of crime victims.

In 1991, Governor Shaefer of Maryland granted clemency to eight battered women. In Ohio, Governor Richard Celeste granted clemency for victims of domestic abuse to 26 women just before he left office. In Pennsylvania, we have only had one application in recent years where abuse by a husband was a factor in the application. However, there have been a number of cases where a husband or boyfriend has killed his partner and then he has asked the board for commutation of his life sentence. I don't recall any of these cases actually receiving a hearing.

Another common type of application involves retail theft convictions. Although the first conviction for retail theft is only a summary offense, future arrests may result in more serious charges. Therefore, the conviction is entered on an individual's criminal history with the Pennsylvania State Police. Because a criminal record check is required before someone gets a job teaching children, many of the requests for pardons come from recent college graduates ready to begin their teaching careers. We commonly

hear that these applicants appeared before the district magistrate and they were told that pleading guilty was just like paying a traffic ticket and that the record would be destroyed after a certain number of years.

While the record at the district magistrate level may have been destroyed, records are still kept by the State Police unless the individual is pardoned.

Another area of concern is the issue of granting inmates serving life sentences probation after a set number of years. Having spoken to family members of the victims of murders, I know that Pennsylvania's current policy of life meaning life unless it is commuted by the Governor brings these families great comfort. Because executive elemency already provides the opportunity for a lifer to be considered for early release, there seems to be no need to change the current policy. The pardons process is by no means perfect, but for the purpose of reviewing commutation applications for lifers, it works well.

I've included some statistical information with copies of my testimony. While the number of applications has remained fairly constant over the last two years, we anticipate an increase of lifers seeking commutations during the last two years of Governor Casey's second term. We also anticipate an

increase in the number of driving cases unless there's a change in the current law.

Thank you again for allowing me to share with you the operation of the Board of Pardons and some of our more pressing issues. I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUITZA: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUITZA: Just a brief comment.

This business with suspended driver's licenses, I think that's a very important issue. I think that I tried to get some legislation drafted last year as the term winded down and I don't know, I guess maybe — I didn't know if the department has drafted some legislation on this, but I would be interested in sponsoring it because you have a real situation with, you know, it's like in the old days of the west if you took a guy's horse away it was a pretty serious situation. It's really pretty much the same today, and in many cases I know of one instance where one bad night for a young fellow while he was in high school carned him a suspension until like the year 2010, and this was a youngster who was an honor student, who had all kinds of good things going for him, and the impact

that that's had on his life and not being able to do anything about it. So to the extent that your good offices can promote some changes in that area, I think that's a very good idea. I don't want to see dangerous drivers out there, but I think there's a lot of room to work with that issue.

MR. LORD: And I think it's important to note that most of the cases we see don't involve DUI.

That they're just habitual offenders.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUITZA: Well, yeah, you get that, and you get a case of maybe one kid had a problem one night and you have a hit-and-run, a fleeing and alluding, you know, a couple of red lights and whatever, and there you go. And I think those kind of cases we need to look at. When you take a person's license away from them in this society, it's very difficult.

MR. LORD: Yeah, I just received, was it, yesterday — Tuesday — a copy of the draft legislation which I understand is now in the Governor's Office and they're reviewing it.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUITZA: Well, I'll be in touch with Bob Mustin because he knows that issue came up when we had this Capitol-for-a-day in Sharon last year. The young fellow explained what he had gone

through. It was kind of comical because Colonel Walp
was there on the stage with everybody else and about
100 State Policemen and this individual admitted that
he drove to the hearing that night.

MR. LORD: Yeah, we also had one case where there was a young couple and they had a newborn child and the child had some severe medical problems and it created a great hardship getting their daughter to the hospital to get proper care because they did abide by the law and he wasn't driving, as I understand. I think he had a license from another State because he was an interstate trucker, but he was not driving except for work.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUITZA: That's all.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Kathy.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

BY REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: (Of Mr. Lord)

Q. Mr. Lord, I found your testimony very enlightening for me because I'm just learning what the Board of Pardons does and what the impact is. And I actually recently had something that dealt with a pardon, I think it's now in the Governor's Office, on the retail theft issue, and again a young woman who had

1

5

4

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25 trouble in her early teenage years and now has successfully finished college and wants to start teaching, and I guess what I'm not understanding is if the Governor signs the pardon, then everything is cleaned out? I mean, all the criminal records basically disappear?

Okay, after we get the signed warrant or charter back, we contact the State Police, the Department of Justice in Washington, the sentencing court, and the other people involved. The State Police records then will be expunded for that offense for which the Governor issued the pardon. It is then up to the applicant to go back to the sentencing court and petition that court to expunde the county records. There was a Supreme Court case I believe in 1985 where the court said that the sentencing county did not have the discretion, that the Governor's pardon should be sufficient to wipe out that record, so that the court doesn't -- the court and the county doesn't have the right to say, no, we won't expunge the record, but it's up to the applicant to see that that record on the county level is expunged.

Q. Okay. And the one issue that you raised which actually I think is the case that I'm familiar with almost what happened, when you talk about how, you

know, young people might have pled guilty under the notion that it was like pleading guilty to a traffic ticket, not realizing the long-term impact it would have had, I guess my question is, is there anything we can do about that problem except to educate people that or educate magistrates not to tell people that and educate people that there's no such thing as pleading guilty to -- I mean, I guess what I'm saying is, is there any remedy or is there any ideas or solutions in that area?

A. Well, I think on the district magistrate level they have to make sure that they are giving out the right information, and it seems almost universal what the people say. They told me it was just like a traffic ticket. We've heard that a number of times. I think it's also important for our schools, for our young people to know that shoplifting is a serious crime and that it could have very disastrous effects on your lives.

REPRESENTATIVE GRUITZA: Excuse me, but I thought that those pleas, if they were summary offenses, if it's a first offense and it's under a certain dollar amount, that the district justice has jurisdiction, but if it gets into the misdemeanor offenses, if it's over the monetary threshold, then

1	those guilty pleas are taken to the Court of Common
2	Pleas, or has that been changed recently?
3	MS. MILAHOV: No, you're right, Mike.
4	REPRESENTATIVE GRUITZA: Because I know
5	in most of those situations the courts are pretty
6	careful about spelling out what the rights and what the
7	ramifications are of one of those guilty pleas, but as
8	I recall, and someone can correct me if I'm wrong, I
9	thought that those misdemeanor guilty pleas were taken
10	into Common Pleas Court.
11	MR. LORD: No. If there is a certain
12	amount, most of the cases that we get are for very
13	small amounts. We've had some cases where the
14	merchandise has been under a dollar.
15	REPRESENTATIVE GRUITZA: Then wouldn't
16	those be summary offenses?
17	MR. LORD: Yes.
18	MS. MTLAHOV: Anything under \$150 is a
19	summary offense for the first offenders.
20	REPRESENTATIVE GRUITZA: Okay, but that's
21	what it is. But even in those cases those summary
22	offenses stay on the record, retail theft?
23	MR. LORD: Retail theft stays on the
24	record.
25	REPRESENTATIVE GRUITZA: Okay, a little

refresher course on that. I haven't done one of those in a while. That's right, those summary offenses go on the record.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you. No more questions.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Continuing with that line of comments as regards to people pleading guilty because they are led to believe, I don't think it's so much on the district justices, and I might be wrong, but I do know a lot bears on the prosecution in terms of making people believe that they are doing one thing when they're really doing something else. Now, with the confusion of the ARD programs and people are being made aware that ARD will be wiped out, their record will be expunged automatically in six months, and I don't know if that's true. I think the only way you can get a record expunged, you have to go through court. I don't know if the ARD, maybe you can correct me on that, and I think that's where the confusion is coming in. So some people believe records are being expunged, so when a prosecutor or someone who works in a prosecutor's office, an assistant, kind of lead people to believe that and then they plead guilty, so when they get in

front of the judges, the judges ask them the normal warnings and read the regulations to them they say, yes, they understand, because of what they have been led to believe by the prosecution's stand. I think that's where that confusion comes in.

BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: (Of Mr. Lord)

- Q. A question I wanted to ask is, when you talked about incarcerated applicants not permitted to appear before the board but they are provided with a representative by the Department of Corrections, what kind of representative?
- A. That's the pardons case specialist. It's the office in Camp Hill that specifically deals with clemency applications for incarcerated individuals. Now, they have an option of getting their own representative, either an attorney or someone who's interested in their case, and they can either take the opportunity to use the pardons case specialist in the Department of Corrections or so out and find their own representative.
- Q. Okay. So then the department, that person works for the Department of Corrections?
  - A. Um-hum.

Q. Okay. And any people that are incarcerated would just send any paperwork on through

1 | that person?

- A. Right.
- Q. And they would represent them at the pardon board?
- A. Right. And even if the Commissioner is opposed, even if the staff of the institution is opposed, the pardons case specialist acts as an advocate for that applicant.
- Q. Okay. One other thing you had in here where you said that the Governor is not required to act on the recommendations, and you said something about however, most cases are returned to us. Why is a case returned, if the Governor doesn't act?
- A. Well, if he signs a warrant or a charter, then we're responsible for getting that back to the applicant and getting off the paperwork to the appropriate agency, whether it be the Justice Department or the State Police. He returns them to us after doing one of two things either denying it or granting it. In either case, there's more work for our office to do to notify the people of the Governor's decision.
- Q. Okay, so it usually takes about six months?
  - A. Usually. We have a couple of cases that

are well over a year old, and then we've had one case where it was turned around within a couple of weeks.

- Q. One good thing that I saw in your comments was that you notified the victims, and is that in all cases or is that in just cases of the seven major felonies or violent crimes?
- A. That's whenever there's a victim, whether it's a property crime, whether it's a violent crime. Driving cases where there's no identified victim, obviously we wouldn't contact anyone on that, but we wait until the application actually passes the merit review process and is granted a hearing, and then we inform the victim or the victim's family each step of the way.
- Q. What happens? How do you inform them?

  Is it by writing a registered letter, or if they don't want to appear or can't appear, do they have some kind of advocate on their behalf?
- A. If the district attorney, if the district attorney from the sentencing county wishes to appear, then they usually, and the victim is opposed, they usually serve as the advocate for the victim. If there's a reason why they can't come to Harrisburg, they usually submit something in writing.
  - Q. Okay. All right.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Galia.

BY MS. MILAHOV: (Of Mr. Lord)

Q. I wanted to ask you a little bit more about those who are sentenced to life sentences. Do you have certain parameters in which you will accept requests for commutation of a life sentence, like how many years a person has served, and can you explain that a little bit?

A. The board has no set guidelines. It's not 18 years or 20 years. However, there's pretty much a general rule of thumb of those cases which will be heard, and the average cases — if you're under 12 years, you can be very, very certain that you're probably not going to be heard. If you're over 22 or 23 years and you're recommended by the Department of Corrections, there's a good chance you'll get a hearing. Now, that doesn't mean you'll ultimately be recommended. So statistically someone could look at it and say, well, there must be guidelines, but there are no set rules by the board members.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: As a follow-up to that, you know, last session I took this committee to hold hearings with lifers at three State facilities -

Western State Penitentiary; Muncy, with the women, of course; and Graterford. I think part of the shocking revelation to many of the members that came with us on those hearings inside the prisons was the age of many of the inmates. And it's almost like geriatric centers — walkers, canes, some of them near blindness. It's difficult, I can understand and as time goes by, 15, 20, 25 years, whatever, that victims and/or families are still around they are absolutely vehement about anybody coming out, especially some type of a heinous crime that was committed and a loved one was taken, that they continue to want their pound of flesh and they'll make sure their voice is heard.

1.1

In many cases I think what probably happens is the victims pass away and/or many of the immediate family members and there's not really many people left that were involved in that particular situation. Then it rests in the hands of the Board of Pardons, the Governor, whoever he or she may happen to be, and I begin to wonder how much we want to continue to extract out of people in sentences. I know that you can only react to what is given to you, but of course you have a certain mission, and we heard some cases as examples, and I'm sure this isn't true in every one of these situations, I know it isn't true, but in some of

the horror stories that we heard in some of the prisons, one particular case where three young black men from Philadelphia go into a grocery store, one is in the car. The two that were in the store ending up in a firefight killing the store owner, get in the car and flee, and for whatever circumstances where they had good attorneys, technicalities, appeals, whatever, the two that were involved in the shooting are out walking and the guy behind the wheel that wasn't involved in the shooting is the one that's in there spending life. That kind of rattled me a little bit. It didn't seem fair.

1.3

MR. LORD: That's very common from the cases that we see. I was surprised when I first started reviewing cases of how common that actually is, that the trigger person would plea bargain down to a reduced sentence.

CHATRMAN CALTAGIRONE: And walk.

MR. LORD: And walk within so many years and the person who was really just an accessory to that crime would get a life sentence.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yeah. To me, that is injustice. I mean, I understand the complicity and the accessory and all the other things that go with that, but it bothers me to no end. And that one

particular individual, how many years was he in there?

MS. MILAHOV: He had already been in 18

vears.

15.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Eighteen years. I thought to myself, how much do you want to extract out of this guy?

MS. MILAHOV: And he was a model citizen in the community, too.

MR. LORD: Yeah, parity of sentencing is something that the board considers. However, they also consider the conduct of the individual while they are incarcerated. So even though someone may serve 22 years having been an accessory to the crime and the actual trigger person may get out in 10 or 12 years, if that person hasn't taken advantage of the vocational, the educational, the therapeutic programming while in prison, if they don't have a home plan, if they have many misconducts and a few major misconducts and recent misconducts, even though parity of sentencing might be an important consideration, it's very unlikely that that individual would be recommended for a pardon.

make sense to me until when somebody has, especially the senior citizens that we had seen there, how many more years to live. That's not to say that senior

citizens can't be a threat to people or society at 1 2 I understand that. But somebody who's been in 3 prison 20, 25, 30 years and they're up there in years 4 and they're having extreme difficulty getting around, to me it's cruel to continue to have that person 5 incarcerated. I think more consideration should be 6 7 given for leniency and clemency to let those persons 8 out. It doesn't make sense that we continue to harbor It's going to continue to cause a tremendous 9 10 burden on the Commonwealth financially to keep people 11 in there than to release them, and that's my, you know, that's one concern, and that's not the major concern. 12 13 The major concern that I feel is that if there is 14 remorse, if they've done those programs, and in the 15 case with the gentleman we had talked to, he had. 16 I don't know what the reason was that he had been 17 turned down, but he had tried to get out even through 18 pardons and we just couldn't understand why. 19 MS. BUFFINGTON: I believe he's recently

MS. BUFFINGTON: I believe he's recently filed again, if we're thinking of the same person.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Yeah. Down in Graterford.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. BUFFINGTON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: That concerned me and that bothers me to this day that he's still in

there and the trigger man or men are out walking. It doesn't, you know, we're talking about fairness. It simply isn't fair.

MR. LORD: Um-hum.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: You know, if anything, those guys should have been in there and he should have been walking, but the system, okay. And in the other cases where you have people that are up there in years, you think to yourself, how much punishment is punishment?

MR. LORD: Well, in the last two years we've had two cases where the major emphasis of the application has been the physical health of the applicant. In one case we had someone, I believe he was in his late 60s, who had cancer and he had gone through the process and ready to be recommended and died.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: And died.

MR. LORD: And then we had another one just last fall, someone with AIDS who was in for a relatively minor offense whose family was ready to take care of him and he died while still incarcerated. One of the problems is that we are reactionary. We don't go out and solicit people and say listen, let's apply for a pardon for this. So by the time someone whose

health is deteriorating actually files an application and we do all the paperwork, it's too late. So.

But I know that's something that the board is very, they recognize that the Board of Pardons is a mercy board. The Lieutenant Governor especially does not want to see the Commonwealth be the institution which allows a lot of people to die while incarcerated. He believes if someone is on their deathbed that that's especially a time when mercy is deserved. So the Board of Pardons is very aware of these cases and are very sympathetic to those inmates.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: You know, maybe one of the things that could be done, and I know that you don't have to necessarily advocate this kind of stuff, but you work very closely with the Department of Corrections.

MR. LORD: Um-hum.

Lehman has been a pretty decent guy to work with. It wouldn't hurt that the wardens in each of those State prisons, in cases where especially physical cases with the lifers, that some kind of notice be given to them that this is the procedure if you feel that you want to apply and you've been a model prisoner for umpteen years and you've done all the right things. Maybe some

of them don't want to get out. That's another possibility. They become so adjusted to prison life that some of them just probably figure that's home and that's where they're going to stay the rest of their lives, but I think they should be notified as to what their rights are by the wardens, especially if they're in situations where how many more years or how many other illnesses can they continue to deal with before their lives are terminated? That's just a suggestion. I don't know if this ever has been attempted by any previous Commissioner. I think it can only be humane that something like that be done. All you have to do is spend a little bit of time in the prisons. talking about with people that have put in a great number of years. They've missed their entire adult life, basically, being incarcorated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LORD: Yeah. I will talk to our liaison with the Department of Corrections and let him know that — when we do get these cases we expedite them, and the Department of Corrections has been very helpful in doing that. So I know that there's concern on the other side, too, so I'll definitely talk to him.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: You see, the other thing that I've kept saying and I'm going to continue to say it, and I'm probably going to offend some people

when I continue to say it, is that they've got to close down some of these facilities. I don't think we need to build empires for people, and I think what is being said today is more true and more to the point. more interference in family lives, in communities and in what's been going on in our society, and I think people need -- government especially needs to step back away from it, and by building these empires, people continue to want more and more power, and that's government. And that's why I say, I told Joe personally, I said, Joe, you're going to have one guy on your back for the next two years, it's going to be me, to close down those older prisons. We don't need Graterfords, we don't need Camp Hills as testaments to bureaucracy or the efficiency of a bureaucracy by incarcerating larger and larger numbers of our people. With fewer and fewer facilities, you've got to come up with other alternatives, and that would help to eliminate a lot of your workload.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LORD: Well, anything that can be done to help eliminate our workload we certainly wouldn't be opposed to, but most of our cases, the heaviest part of our workload is not with people who are already incarcerated. They are pretty cut and dry because we don't have to do all of the background

1	investigation.
2	BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: (Of Mr. Lord)
3	Q. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask, how
4	often do you meet?
5	A. We meet usually about once a month, nine
6	months out of the year.
7	Q. Okay. Is it possible that we can get a
8	list? Are your meetings listed previously or do you
9	just come up with them from month to month?
10	Λ. Oh, no. We have the dates annually.
11	Q. So can the committee get a list of the
12	meetings so that some of us may want to attend the
13	moetings?
14	A. Right. They're in Harrisburg, usually or
15	a Thursday.
16	Q. When is your next one?
17	A. March 25. It's March 25 in the lobby of
18	the Education Building, 333 Market Street, Heritage
19	Room A and B. And they start at about 9:00, and we're
20	usually done by around 1:00.
21	Q. Is the Board of Probation and Parole, is
22	that different than this board?
23	Λ. Um—hum.
24	Q. Okay, that deals with counties?

That deals with just really probation.

Q. Okay. Thank you. 1 2 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We're going to 3 have them in, as a matter of fact. REPRESENTATIVE JAMES: Oh great. 4 5 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I don't know what the date is on that. 6 7 MS. MILAHOV: March 18. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: March 18. 8 9 MS. MILAHOV: I have a couple more 10 questions. 11 BY MS. MILAHOV: (Of Mr. Lord) 12 I was looking at your statistic sheet Q. 13 here and I see that you hear more cases than you grant 14 hearings to. 15 Α. Um-hum. How does that come about? 16 Well, this is a yearly, calendar year is 17 how we generate our statistics, and if we granted a 18 19 whole lot of hearings in December of one year, they 20 wouldn't be heard until January of the next year. So 21 it's not really -- the number of hearings that are 22 granted one year might not necessarily correspond with the number of hearings that are heard. 23 24 And then just following through on that Q.

same idea, I very much feel that the board is a

25

reactive agency and I'm wondering if it would be appropriate to legislate something in which you could be more of a proactive agency to review cases before a person who is incarcerated would have a chance to learn the process of asking for clemency or pardon. For instance, in the abused wife situation. I believe that what was done in Ohio is that the Governor took it upon himself to form a committee that reviewed cases in which there were homicides and life sentences to see if the parameters fell within a certain concept of an abuse spouse syndrome, and then they reviewed cases after that.

A. Well, specifically with the abused spouses, I was surprised when I went through the files that there weren't more applications where that was a factor. I think maybe for our purposes, one way that we might want to consider dealing with letting people know that this is an option is perhaps a little bit more public focus on the options that an abused spouse might have. It's always better to prevent something from happening than doing something afterward, but even with those cases where the wife has been charged with a crime, I think that to let them know that this is an option, I don't know about the special panel or what we could do. We're a very small office. We have right

1	now we have three employees in the office, including
2	me, and then we have the board members. So I don't
3	know how helpful we could be in forming a panel, but
4	it's something that we could look into.
5	MS. MILAHOV: Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Are there any
7	other questions?
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Thank you very
10	much.
11	MR. LORD: Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Appreciate it.
13	We'll conclude these hearings.
14	(Whereupon, the proceedings were
15	concluded at 12:50 p.m.)
16	
17	
18	
19	•
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

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. 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