

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 27, 2005 LB 117

justify the means and that. This is such an incredibly dangerous product that it seems to make sense to me to require this additional hurdle. I am really reluctant to removing the 18-years-of-age requirement from the bill. I heard Senator Chambers talk about how it is weak now. I don't agree. Senator Stuhr mentioned the same thing, and I don't agree. I think what we have if we stay the course here is the most comprehensive methamphetamine bill in the entire country. And I am reluctant to make any changes in terms of weaken it. One thing I will tell you is that there are controlled substances under federal law where a prescription is not required, and I'm getting a list of what those substances are. But they may be dispensed by a pharmacist without a prescription to a purchaser at retail, provided that...and it gives a whole bunch of criteria. And one of the criteria is that the purchaser is at least 18 years of age. And I'd also suggest that Senator Chambers, and sometimes he has great ideas on these bills but, quite honestly, Senator Chambers might not have thought through all the permutations of it. And that's not a criticism on him at all, but what I'm suggesting is is that...think about the elderly people you know. My parents are in their early 70s and are in pretty good health, but both of them are on prescription medications. They're on prescriptions that require them to go to the pharmacist on a regular basis with a prescription and get drugs. Now when I was 15 or 16 or 13 or 12 or any age under 18, I could not go to the store for them and get their prescription. So what I'm suggesting is is that, yeah, this is a bit of a hurdle. You have to be 18 years of age, and I absolutely respect what Senator Chambers is talking about because I represent north Omaha as well, and it seems to be a common occurrence in north Omaha that kids will tend to grow up with a grandparent or an uncle or an aunt, and it is a little bit of an inconvenience that they can't send a young person down there for a quart of milk. But when they are already on some sort of prescription medication, and federal law already says that they can't purchase that drug if you're under 18, it doesn't seem to me to be a huge inconvenience. And perhaps Senator Chambers didn't know about this, but I would urge him to consider it. I'm concerned that if we lower the age, then all of a sudden we won't have the ID requirement in the bill. I feel that if the ID requirement is not there and the age is reduced, I do feel