why I've been supportive of the bill, Senator Chambers, regardless of all of the things. And you pointed out some things may, in fact, have changed the tempo just a little bit, but I still believe that the original intent of the bill is there.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Vrtiska, are you aware that this bill has nothing to do with drinking and driving? Are you aware that driving and drinking is not involved in this bill at all?

SENATOR VRTISKA: Well, not directly, but indirectly it is.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Aren't there laws that cover that already?

SENATOR VRTISKA: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So this has nothing to do with that. This bill has to do only with a youngster drinking some alcohol, not even...it doesn't even mention the amount drinking any or otherwise ingesting it, and I don't know how else you would ingest alcohol than by drinking. But, nevertheless, that's the amendment that Senator Quandahl wants to put on the bill. The thing that will allow an officer to make an arrest is to observe signs of alcohol consumption. Senator Quandahl doesn't know what all that word "signs" means. He doesn't know what all these signs are. I'm not going to ask you because you didn't put it there, but I'm just suggesting that, if your constituents call, you might mention to them that there are things in the bill which nobody knows what they mean. But that's all that I will ask of you. Thank you.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Members of the Legislature, I say again there is no guarantee that we will get to Senator Quandahl's amendment, but, even if we do, merely getting rid of that obnoxious language about the presumption means nothing to me. Even if he had not tried to strike it, the court would have struck that down. So he didn't do anything to take away my opposition to the bill. My strongest opposition is to the fact that we're taking a privilege to drive away...