

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

May 5, 1999

LB 44

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...it through the state court. And so I want to understand, do they have to send it to the federal court in some circumstances, all circumstances? And, if they have the option not to, then perhaps a even simpler solution than Senator Chambers' solution would say...would be to say no law...no local law enforcement or state law enforcement agency shall send the money to...through the federal court, shall not go through the federal courts for this purpose. I'd invite your comment with the remainder of my time on that question.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Senator Beutler. How much time is left?

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: Okay. It will be hard to provide any kind of an answer, but I'll...a very quick one, Senator Beutler. I think many of these drug enforcement activities are cooperative efforts by several agencies. We've seen that in our area in the last few years. Those that have been successful have to involve several agencies, including perhaps in some cases the federal authorities. In those situations, I think they have to decide or have a cooperative decision on whether they're going to take it through federal court or state court. Many things could be taken either place. Now, as Senator Chambers has accurately pointed out, the procedures, if you go through federal court, are different. The burden of proof is different than it is in state court. That may be a factor. Getting the federal government's backing and cooperation and interest in the activity may be a factor in getting them involved. If they're going to be involved and use manpower and resources, they have an interest in the outcome.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Time.

SENATOR BROMM: And if it goes through federal court they possibly get part of the proceeds.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Well, Mr. President, Senator Bromm, do you want to take