

originally introduced by Senator Conway, I think, was probably the best proposal to date, because with the amendments that you've adopted already to the bill, I think it is in as good a form, although I'm not saying it could not be improved upon, as it has been at any time. And the concept is one of, as Senator Wesely mentioned it, it may be the only way that you can possibly deal with this type of an issue. It is kind of almost funny to think that you have to get them any way that you can at this point. And the proposal, in its original form, as Senator Conway brought in, I thought was a very good one. He had an individual from the Department of Revenue in the State of Minnesota come down and testify on behalf of the proposal and explain to the Revenue Committee that it does work, that it has worked. What Senator Conway does now with his amendment is strike the entire bill, and he puts in its place the amendment that you'll find on the Journal page as he stated, and it deals with subject matter that the Revenue Committee did not even deal with, but to say that it is exactly like the original form, or very similar to LB 260, is I think inaccurate. And the proposals particularly, the striking of the stamp, the changing of the fines from a dollar figure to a percentage of whatever the retail value is of the drug that happens to be on hand, I guess, puts into the hands of the State Patrol to determine what the street value is of that drug. Twenty-five percent of what? Do I then, as a drug dealer, get a break on my taxes because I sell my drugs at a lower rate? Because I decide that I'm going to sell an ounce of marijuana for \$50 instead of \$100, or whatever the going rate may be, do I get a break on my taxes? I mean you have to have...The bill, as it was originally brought in, if you heard and listened to the committee amendments, was a very minor tax, and we talked about that extensively. I read the transcript on the way down this morning with the folks from the Department of Minnesota, Revenue Committee of Minnesota, with Senator Conway who said he would endorse the concept of increasing the tax, and that was the reason for it is that we had to, in some form or fashion, affect these individuals who are in the business of selling illegal drugs, and the way to do it was through the pocketbook. And if we did it after the fact, Senator Wesely, I guess it was the thought of the committee that better than than never. And right now we're at a point of never. It just isn't happening. With the Conway amendments you're dealing with a number of things, you're dealing with removing the criminal penalty. You put in a jeopardy notice that I'm not very clear with, and I'll have some questions for Senator Conway when my light goes on next. But what also