

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I rise here in a rather difficult position. I oppose Senator Kelly's bill, and I oppose it as the father of ten children who has watched those children grow and I would have to say that, for whatever reasons, I have had no problems with them, perhaps because of their mother's training I suppose, but in any case, I just want to point out that this body is a body of compromise and oftentimes we find that in the legislative process it is necessary for those of us of differing opinions to work out solutions that are more acceptable than that which is originally presented by the introducer of a bill. Unfortunately sometimes in the area of compromise we really do not arrive at a compromise at all, but we arrive at a point where we attempt to confuse the issue and, in fact, delude the public. Senator Kelly's bill is a very forthright bill. If you feel that those who are 19 years of age are not old enough to handle liquor then you should vote for Senator Kelly's bill. On the other hand, for the reasons given if you feel the 19 year olds can reasonably handle that responsibility, then you would vote against the bill. What we have in this amendment is simply an attempt to try to go back home and tell our constituents who have been writing me and telling me that 19 and 20 year olds should not be allowed to drink, that we did a responsible thing. We have said they can drink under supervision. Well, ladies and gentlemen, my children can drink under supervision in my home today...my supervision. Is the supervision that is permissible and possible and available in a tavern any different if we pass this bill or if it is not? I will give you a little for instance. My children, some of whom are old enough now that the bill will not affect them, are in the tavern, three of them we will say...two of them are under the age of 21 and one is over. They are having a beer, strange as that may seem and as terrible as it may seem to some of you, but they are having a beer. It comes time to leave the tavern and the 21 year old buys a six-pack and gets out in the car with the 18 year old and the 19 year old and the 20 year old. Suppose that an officer stops them...who is responsible. Is the 21 year old going to be guilty of procuring liquor for a minor? Suppose that the 20 year old owns and operates the automobile. Is that individual guilty of minor in possession? Does anyone really realistically and honestly believe that the 21 year old, the 20 year old and the 19 year old, all of whom have been drinking together for an hour or two, are not going to continue to drink? Does anyone believe the 21 year old is going to drink the entire six-pack by themselves and that the 19 year old and the 20 year old are going to sit there and watch it? Obviously not. This is exactly what you are doing. You want to go back and tell the