

complicated but I think we've...I think I've figured out where he is making the changes on the original green copy. I think I've figured it out, right, lower it down. I know that this particular proposal was not brought before the Legislature either. As Senator Chambers said, I don't think we've ever had a bill that has come in to address this, and I know certainly we didn't have one this year, and it wasn't a part of the original issue. It came up, Senator Lindsay raised it during the...during our discussions that we had when we were going...when the bill was rereferred back to our committee to look at amendments, and, apparently, this was an amendment that was going to be offered on the floor by Senator Lindsay, but it wasn't addressed when we had the hearing on the original bill. It wasn't addressed with...it wasn't addressed in our original discussion when we sent the bill out, and it came up...came up when we were debating the issue that had been sent back to...back to our committee. And I guess that was part of my objection is that we've had a bill in place that has been used by police departments or state patrol, county attorneys throughout the state. It's been a piece of legislation that they've used to deal with drug dealers. The bill specifically provides for these mandatory minimum sentences for individuals that are involved in selling and distributing of cocaine and crack, and I felt that, even though the Governor hadn't really talked about the issue, I felt that by raising the amounts and in effect reducing the penalties for individuals that are involved in the sale, distribution, and profiting of crack cocaine, I felt that that was not in keeping with the general philosophy of what the bill was supposed to be, which was to try to reduce criminal activity by increasing penalties. The purpose of the bill, it has a number of sections that deal with mandatory minimum sentences, and the philosophy behind having mandatory minimum sentences that has been espoused by the supporters of the bill is that this will reduce the amount of crime that we have in our state. And it seems completely foreign that we would attempt to, essentially, gut this section dealing with the distribution of crack and powder cocaine. I objected to the bill, I objected to the amendment because it went opposite of what the bill was supposed to be, and I am sorry if I wasn't going to vote the bill out, but, yeah, I had some real serious problems about that because I view the sale and distribution of crack cocaine as a very serious problem in this state. And I guess my advice to people that are upset about the high penalties that they receive for the distribution and sale of the drug is not to sell the drug, or not to