

drug trade and traffic on a different approach and that is to regulate it economically, to try to take some of the profit out of it and also to try to put into it some further hurdles and some further difficulties for the drug trade, that we're going to go after them criminally and we should do so. We should put more money into enforcement. We should put more money into education. We should do a lot of the things that Senator Chambers tells us we should do in some of the other areas. But one of the things that has brought this to my attention with great interest was I went back and read some of the cases that had thrown these laws out in South Dakota. Then I went back and read some of the cases that had left it in in Minnesota. And I believe our law is a constitutional law after reading both of those cases. In South Dakota, quite frankly, they passed this law so that drug dealers and drug traders would have to tell the revenue people who they were and what they were doing, and that way then the revenue people would go out, we got the information legally, and then they would pass it on to the authorities and, in effect, it violated the Fifth Amendment something fierce, and because of that violation of the Constitution, that statute was thrown out. What Minnesota did was went back and said, look, that's not our purpose in doing this activity. It is not a method of drawing in names, addresses and telephone numbers of drug dealers so we can turn them over to the State Patrol. In effect, what this is is economic regulation and the Minnesota statute is drawn very, very similar to LB 260. And Minnesota upheld this law I believe back in 1988, if I remember right, early '88, saying that this was not violative of the Constitution, that there wasn't an infringement on the right of incrimination and that there was some opportunity for the people who were purchasing the stamps to do so in anonymity and not to reveal their status, their address or anything that would be used to aid a criminal conviction. In fact, in reading through Senator Conway's LB 260, I don't believe that is true. I think, after reading the cases, it appears to me that that is a workable provision and one that we should support. No, it's not going to do away with all drug abuse and drug use in this state, that's foolhardy. Is it going to help? Yes, I think it will. And, with that, I would urge the passage of LB 260. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Chambers, followed by Senator Byars.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, sometimes I get so frustrated I don't know what to do down here. I guess I do know what to do because I press right on. But a