

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...from a bill as a favor to somebody, and we're not enacting legislation as favors, Senator Bernard-Stevens, to those who have trash legislation. We're supposed to be enacting fair, just laws that achieve a worthwhile social purpose. And if you can stand on this floor when you turn your light on and tell me that you think its constitutional to put into a bill that the execution of a sentence cannot be...give you the exact wording, "the execution of his or her sentence cannot be suspended for any reason," which would include overturning of the sentence on appeal. That's what he's asking us to go for. If a bill is a priority bill, don't say that it has a lot of trouble because it's a priority bill. That's the very reason it ought to be very carefully drafted.

PRESIDENT NICHOL: Time. Thank you. Senator Langford; followed by Senator Landis; Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR LANGFORD: Thank you, Mr. President. I want to thank Senator Bernard-Stevens for bringing back the reconsideration. I think this bill is something we need so badly to protect the spot where all children congregate.

PRESIDENT NICHOL: Pat.

SENATOR LANGFORD: The children...Pardon? The children are there because they're in school, or because it's a spot where they go for recreation. It may be a spot of geography, but it's where children are and they should be safe in their schools or in their play areas. I think this is a very good bill and, just to prove that I mean exactly what I am saying, I am going to withdraw my amendment on this bill when it comes up in hopes that it can go through clean. And again, thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens, for giving us this opportunity.

PRESIDENT NICHOL: Thank you, Senator Landis, please; followed by Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I'm not sure I understand exactly the rationale here for the change. Although I certainly can sense that the waters are different; that some work has been done, I don't exactly understand what's the argument for the reconsideration. Is it that the principle that was adopted yesterday with this amendment to the Johnson amendment was mistaken? Is it an endorsement of the underlying