

to face up to the problems with alcohol. It's the biggest problem there is and we insist on going overboard with penalties for drugs that we wouldn't even consider. Life in prison, we wouldn't even consider that for many, many other heinous crimes. So you're making a judgment call here that doing drugs is just the worst thing possible. We can't take the time to address the root of the problem. We can't take the effort to address poverty, ignorance, and hopelessness. It's much easier to simply stand up here and say, well, execute them all. I've got a cartoon here from the Christian Science Monitor. I had it all ready to pass out, but I haven't passed it out except for Senator Korshoj. It says, "Vote for me; I'll execute the convicted murders." The other man says, "Oh yeah? I'll execute the arrested murders." His opponent says, "I'll execute suspected murders." And his opponent says, "I'll execute people who haven't even done anything yet." The opponent says, "What", and the politician...the politician says, "Thank you. Thank you. I love you all." And that's where we're heading, folks. That's where we're heading. I'd urge you to adopt Senator Chambers' amendment.

PRESIDENT NICHOL: Thank you. Senator Bernard-Stevens, please; followed by Senator Hall and Senator Lowell Johnson.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. Senator Johnson, you know, I'm not sure what you're going to say or do on this particular amendment, so I'll guess I'll try to say what I think we would do, and I don't think it's that bad of an amendment to agree to and I'll try to state why, though, on the other hand, I will also be able to argue, Lowell, where it may not be that helpful, as well. What Senator Chambers is actually trying to do is simply say that when we're comparing crimes, whether we're talking about ounces of marijuana or speeding 200 miles an hour down an interstate or something along that type, that there is a difference in the type of crime committed and certainly there should be a difference in the type of punishment, and that the bill is going to get those skewed in a particular manner. Instead of going to the "IB" level that would be the ceiling, if you wish, on your amendment, Senator Chambers is going to just try to lower that ceiling, you know, just one step lower, and I guess theoretically I don't have a problem with that because, in my mind, the court's word, if we went to the top, the "IB", I doubt seriously that we're going to get life imprisonment or anything else; that they're going to get some type of so many years. I