

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, I will sit down and put on my light.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Bernard-Stevens, please.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the body, I am kind of in a quandary of what to do with the Landis amendment. Quite honestly, I have some reservations about the bill, 976, but I think those reservations can be cured at some point through the amendment process. I understand Senator Landis, what he is trying to do with the Johnson amendment because we set two different criteria, then one is a zone and a geographic criteria, and I, too, have some real concerns with that. I guess my problem is if we agree with the Landis amendment, then we cannot pursue, necessarily, some of the areas in 976, and I think Senator Pirsch and others deserve to have an opportunity to do that. The Landis amendment would, in essence, strip all of that out. So I guess I am speaking against the Landis amendment at this point, but I also want to comment for a couple of reasons on the Johnson amendment that Senator Landis wants to maintain, and that is being in public education, well, we use that a lot, but I have been around kids for a long time as many of you have, and the one thing that I am convinced of is that increasing the fine is not going to solve a problem, and as Senator Johnson has with his amendment, and maybe later when he gets his chance to speak a little bit, he can clarify some things for me, but the way I understand the amendment, if I am 18 or younger and I distribute and set up my own distribution network within the school, I am not covered necessarily by...in fact, I am not covered at all by the bill. The bill only refers to those 18 or older, or if they use a person 18 or younger to distribute for them. It totally, apparently it is inconceivable or it is not possible or it doesn't happen out there that actually someone 18 or younger will be in the business of making money by selling or distributing illegal drugs. And, in fact, that does happen out there, and this bill ignores that. So, consequently, I have a problem with that particular amendment simply because I think if we would agree with the amendment all that we would do is simply create a new what President Nixon would have called a private enterprise zone, because it certainly would bring a higher incentive I think for those young kids to get involved. And I don't think that is the message we want to send at all. I also think the body needs to go in and ask themselves a deep question as to why. are our young people buying the illegal drugs. Why