

principle in LB 976? Apparently Senator Langford does...acknowledges that that's an appropriate rationale, but I'm not sure that I understand. Is it that we are returning to the notion that says that depending on where a child is located there should be a higher penalty for selling drugs to them? Because I couldn't make that out in Senator Bernard-Stevens' remarks and he's the next speaker. I'll be fascinated to hear. I don't think the discussion was confused yesterday. I don't think we were deluded. I don't think that we were confused. It seemed to me that the body was making a knowing choice. Senator Langford just expressed that value choice again. She said, you know, this spot where children congregate may be geography, but it's a place where children are, whether it's for school or for recreation. What if children are in a spot that is neither school nor for recreation? Should their protection be less? Is it somehow the case that they're fairer gam ; that the wrong of selling them drugs in a location which does not happen to be school or does not happen to be recreation is somehow less, less heinous? I don't think so. The greater wrong is to sell drugs to kids, not that we sell drugs to kids in certain locations. That value choice was clearly spelled out yesterday and the body made a decision. I would be interested again in having Senator Bernard-Stevens explain to us what the principle that he is espousing is. If I understood it, it is more a deference to an introducer of a bill. And as much as the deference I would pay Senator Pirsch, who has served in this body for 12, the same 12 years that I have, and we have agreed and disagreed on many bills, I'm sure that Senator Pirsch would agree that if she had to choose between the well-being of children and paying deference to me, her choice would be the children, as legitimately it should be. That's right, whether it was my priority bill or not, if she thought the welfare of children was at risk, she would pursue that interest, would she not? That's why she's introduced LB 976. I feel the same way. Deference is irrelevant here. This is not a matter of deference. This is a matter of the welfare of children. My guess is that Senator Pirsch would acknowledge that that's what's at issue here, not deference, not names on bills, not protocol, not the niceties between senators, but what's good for kids, what's the best way to attack drugs. She's serious-minded about it, so am I. We happen to disagree as to which principle is more important. My guess is that her sensibilities are not so slender or thin that a good-faith discussion of how to pursue that agenda with a tough-minded attitude is legitimate. I am interested in understanding in what way today is different than yesterday, and