

voted for last year, and it's one that I will vote for today. I think that the debate today points out something that often happens when we get a bill that is somewhat, at least seems to have the vast majority of senators behind it for various reasons. But just because of that fact, just because it appears a slam dunk that this bill will pass with 30, or 35, or 40 votes, it still is important that we dissect parts of the bill that are going to have far-reaching impacts down the line. I think Senator Chambers has hit upon a very crucial issue. I think it's important that Senator Chambers is not filing motions to bracket the bill, or suggesting that the bill be killed, or that we abandon the process. He may not vote for it, but at least he's not suggesting that. But he is suggesting, I think, a very good amendment, one that will, I think, answer a lot of concerns that I have and that a lot of citizens are going to have about the rights to appeal in the most "heinous" criminal cases, where the Constitution...and it may be, as Senator Kristensen suggests, that the only thing that is appealed is the sentence, or some other minor error in the proceeding in this type of felony. However, it is more likely that the issues that will be discussed in those kinds of cases are issues of greater import, and granted the Supreme Court can take those cases under the bill as it is now written. But I think that we, as a Legislature, in implementing this court have a duty to make a strong statement that we not only desire the Supreme Court to take all of these cases, but that we, in fact, direct the Supreme Court to take all of these cases. In the other areas I think that the issue of discretion versus direction is a good issue and needs to...and I think Senator Kristensen probably carries the day on most of those issues. But I think on this particular point Senator Chambers is just absolutely right, he's just absolutely right that the Legislature should direct the judicial body in this case to take these cases, and leave it to the judiciary, to the Supreme Court, to this new system, leave it to their discretion to handle issues of great import in other cases. But I, and I also agree with Senator Chambers that the system by which we sentence offenders in our state is outmoded, is archaic, is inconsistent, and needs to be changed. And we need to look at that. And I think it's one of those sort of issues that we'd rather not deal with, it's not fun, it's not glamorous, it doesn't get a lot of plaudits from our constituents, but it's an issue that needs to be discussed, and it is integral to our criminal justice system. And if we continue to have these types of cases directly appealable to the Supreme Court, at least we have, I think, at least a foot in the