

Senator Chambers is probably right, we don't necessarily need a special classification for drug penalties like this. But I think, just like we did in the early 1980s, we, the Legislature, are reacting now today to a problem of drug use, particularly a problem with cocaine and crack. Now we are wrong, we are wrong to sit here and claim that we're solving the problem, but this bill is one more piece of the puzzle that I think is wise just as it was in battling the drunken driving problems early in the 1980s, it helped. This bill doesn't hurt the cause at all. I firmly believe it helps the cause somewhat, and Senator Chambers and I may debate on how much it actually helps it; I think there's no doubt that it will help our battle against drugs somewhat and, for that reason, we shouldn't just give up because for 100 years we've been battling this problem. We also shouldn't beat our chests and say we're going to eradicate the problem by the turn of the century again, but we should not indefinitely postpone this bill, as Senator Chambers urges us to do, and instead we should pass this bill and continue to help address the war on drugs. I urge you to oppose Senator Chambers' kill motion.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Nelson, followed by Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR NELSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, Senator Abboud did answer some of my questions and how many are affected and in committee hearings I had a question in my own mind and expose some of my knowledge or my no knowledge, I guess it was, of the quantity and so on. I do feel that a lot of these, and my question was, is this related to the college kid or the person that is distributing drugs maybe to support his own habit or so on, and I see rehabilitation as a great tool in those cases. And I'm also aware of the crowding problem at our prisons and so on, and I was wondering, in my own mind, are we accomplishing anything? I, too, have the same concerns as Senator Chambers. I think that we have Larry King out walking the streets yet today. And we don't want to go soft on drugs, we need one more tool, and it's not only Omaha's problem, it's outstate problem too. And we definitely would not want to change that, but my concern is by creating another class and where the word says mandatory, is the penalty too strong that judges would not sentence and actually would go the other direction? And I won't support the kill motion at this time, but I do, I have some sincere questions in the bill. Are we going too far and too strong and when we say mandatory? There