

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I rise to support Senator DeCamp's amendment, and I guess I would ask that the members of the Legislature think exactly about what sort of message the rejection of that amendment and other issues which are charged to the age of majority, what sort of message will be sent out to the 19 and 20 year olds of the state. If you would indulge me I'd like to go into a little bit of, I guess, 1960s nostalgia, which is...and I think become fairly popular as we enter the 1980s and the movie Hair comes out and people think back to the old days. That was when I was in college, and that was when this Legislature chose to lower the age of majority with regards to drinking, entering into contracts and other rights, from 21 to 19. Now looking at the attitudes expressed in this Legislature now, I guess I am incredulous as to how that ever happened, particularly when you consider what I and other people at the University and in the state were involved in. If we want to talk about maturity, I would think that the attitude of this Legislature would be that the current generation of 19 and 20 year olds, which scares me sometimes because they're so conservative, that that current generation would be more mature than the generation that was active and involved ten years ago when this Legislature lowered the age of majority. At that time we were involved in great national protests, buildings were occupied at the University, President Varner's office would get visited periodically and people would stay after five o'clock, drugs were becoming popular, phrases like tune in, turn on, drop out...all that sort of thing was going on with 19 year olds and 20 year olds, and this Legislature chose then to give those 19 and 20 year olds certain rights and privileges that were not available previously. Now, when things are quiet on campuses, when the Business College is overflowing with students, when people are looking for jobs, when students are trying to figure what is the most responsible way for me to act so that I can get employed, when protest is frowned on, when basic political action is considered to work through the system, this Legislature then decides the 19 and 20 year olds aren't mature. It doesn't make sense to me if I really understand the attitudes of this Legislature, and having served here seven years, I sometimes think I do. But on days like today, I just don't understand the logic. It seems to me the message that would be sent if you look at when the age of majority was lowered and what students were doing, versus now when we're talking about keeping 19 and 20 year olds from having privileges, the message that we're sending out