

also have this feeling that if the crime was so bad that the judge felt that it needed to be a higher one, then he would probably go to the maximum of 50 years. And I'm really not sure, you know, even if we went to the higher one and you took...take the good time and everything else, would probably be right around that 50-year period anyway or below. So I'm really not sure if the Chambers amendment harms the amendment that you offer at all. In fact, it may make it a little bit easier for some other people a little bit more palatable to support the amendment. I guess my feeling, members of the body, is the amendment is a...is one that you can go one way or the another and it really doesn't change the focus of the amendment, so it's simply a policy decision of what the body wants to do. In this particular case, if you agree with the Chambers amendment, you may in fact on the very serious crime set the ceiling and the floor at 50 years, but you can't go above that. If you reject the Chambers amendment, then you can go to the "IB" category, but chances are the way decisions have been made, in most cases you won't get the maximum so you're going to be right around the "IC" category or below that Senator Chambers would set with his amendment anyway. So I really feel that in this particular case, if it makes the amendment a little bit more palatable, it certainly doesn't change the intent of what we're trying to do. It certainly sends a strong message. I think this is one that we could agree to and it wouldn't slow us up much further and we might be able to move on. And with that, members of the body, I would...I guess I would urge the adoption of the amendment because it doesn't change that much of the intent of the Johnson amendment at this time. Thank you.

PRESIDENT NICHOL: Thank you. Senator Hall, please; followed by Senator Lowell Johnson.

SENATOR HALL: I'll pass.

PRESIDENT NICHOL: Pass. Senator Lowell Johnson.

SENATOR L. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, Senator Bernard-Stevens said it better than I can even, and I would say that it would be agreeable to me, as introducer of the amendment, to accept the "IC" classification.

PRESIDENT NICHOL: Okay, thank you. Senator Chambers; followed by Senator Hefner. Okay. Senator Hefner, please. Question been called, do I see five hands? I do. Two of them are on one