

amendment that we passed the other day. Senator Hoagland has repeatedly said that this bill, this law, was a fine-tuned bill, and it was, and it is. But now Senator Hoagland wants to "untune" it, put it out of tune. He opened the first crack the other day. Certainly that amendment was much more discriminating than this one is, and this is an attempt to make it fair for all people. Maybe Senator Chambers is angry, but I'm just as angry that we are messing with this law. I have a request in from the...to the Attorney General asking whether this will be fair and whether it can stand. Let me just give you a couple of statistics as to why the bill is working, the law is working. Listen to just two statistics, if you would please. The number of deaths in 1981, almost 200, 189 deaths in 1981. What was it in 1985? Ninety-one, less than half what it was in 1981 and we want to change the law? That is crazy. We should leave it alone. It is working. You have heard no comments from your constituents, I will bet, to change this law. I haven't had one. Now maybe you've had one or two, perhaps from those who have been arrested. As soon as we put the word out, you can get around the bill, believe me we'll all be getting around it as we were before this law passed three or four...four or five years ago. I urge you to support Senator Chambers' amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Higgins. Senator Abboud is next.

SENATOR HIGGINS: Thank you, Mr. President, colleagues. I guess everybody is angry this morning. I'm angry for a different reason. Senator Hoagland has introduced this bill and for five years all I've heard from the Judiciary Committee is we are "agin" or against mandatory sentences. Yet this bill contains mandatory minimum sentences for someone who gets in a car and drives after they've had two or three drinks, and if they are stopped they are considered intoxicated. They haven't killed anybody. They haven't hit anybody, not even a tree, another car, but they should have a mandatory sentence, a mandatory minimum sentence. Yet my child pornography bill they absolutely refused, the lawyers on the Judiciary Committee especially, to have a mandatory minimum sentence for men and women that use little children to make the most filthy, obscene movies and pictures they can. There is the hypocrisy behind this bill. Senator Chambers mentioned hypocrisy. I agree, it is the hypocritical thing the Judiciary Committee has ever put