

pound or more of marijuana would be guilty of a Class IV felony and I think it is a very serious offense. A Class IV felony being a maximum of five years or \$10,000 fine and/or both. I think, Mr. President, and members of the Legislature, the issue is rather clear. If there is any other questions before we vote, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Senator Cullan.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I would like to ask a question of Senator Venditte, if I may. Could you just give us an idea of what, when we are talking about a pound, what size of container or how much are you talking about?

SENATOR VENDITTE: According to the President's Commission on Drug Abuse one ounce, one ounce is enough for 16 cigarettes and they have said it can be as much as a four months supply. Now one pound of marijuana is probably enough to make almost 900 cigarettes or a five year supply. Now as far as the cost of marijuana is concerned, be it one ounce, one pound, I couldn't give you the figures on that, Senator Cullan.

SENATOR CULLAN: Okay, thank you very much, Senator Venditte. I think Pat pointed out something that is very important. Any person who is possessing a pound of marijuana is not using it for their personal use and Senator Schmit said awhile ago that what we really need to concentrate on are those individuals who are selling marijuana and other drugs and I agree with him and I support Senator Venditte's amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Barnett.

SENATOR BARNETT: Mr. President, again, I would urge the body to defeat this amendment and, Senator Venditte, I guess I am not going to ask you a question but I do point out something in your debate. It is strange that you can talk about the President's commission on this issue and have reliable information from them but yet on the previous issue you said they are totally..you know, it is totally not right. I don't quite follow your thinking. On the first amendment you offered, you didn't want us to pay any attention to the President's commission. Now on this one, you want us to pay attention. I guess I don't understand your theory. I would hope that what you could do is address this question, members of the Legislature, when we come to it in the other issue before us, on the bill, and one thing I had better point out to you. I guess we have sort of missed it and I have probably not given you the information. If you will pay attention to the amendments as he is offering them to you, he is making it sound good that he is getting tougher than the devil but yet he is really not doing anything because the minimums are still left as they were. He is increasing the maximum so that you people in some areas of the state may have somebody going in for a tougher penalty than you would in other phases and I think Senator Venditte knows this. There are no minimums that he is adjusting. He is adjusting the maximums. We are leaving the minimums as they are so he is really not doing anything in the penalty section except that he is giving them an opportunity for a much tougher penalty. Now I know there are some of you that would buy that proposition and that is fine. That is what you are here for to make that decision