

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

April 14, 2003 LB 454

that will affect the existing drug courts, which are not run in the manner that Senator Aguilar mentioned. And he has acknowledged it. The systems that are up and running now are not like the one he's trying to get us to change the law for, and change everything in the state for that one program. Wouldn't...

SPEAKER BROMM: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...it be better to let that one get in order? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, the question I wanted to explore a little bit, and that I can't get straight in my own mind, because I don't think it's quite straight in the bill. But the reason that I struck Section 3 was because it talks about the drug court program's local governing body entering into agreements under the Interlocal Cooperation or Joint Public Agency Act. Now, when you look at the definitions in the Interlocal Cooperation Act, it authorizes an agency of state government to enter into it, and local political subdivisions. And under the Joint Public Agency Act, it talks about state agencies being able to enter into it. Now you tell me, what is the governing body of a drug court program? Is that a state agency? I don't think so, Senator Aguilar. And yet it's run out of the court system, which is a state agency. And that's why I was trying to figure out how to get the control of this into the Supreme Court. Then they could enter into interlocal agreements, and you wouldn't need Section 3. And that's kind...I just wanted to explain to you kind of where I'm coming from. It's not that I don't want this to work. It's that "governing body" is not defined, and it's different for every grant program, apparently, depending on how you want to do it. And I don't know if it's wise for us to tolerate all the variations that may come of that, or to try to legislatively elevate that into a state agency of some type. I can't see my way through how that would work well. And that's why I'm suggesting this other direction a little bit. And I think I'll file an amendment to the amendment...well, I'd like to hear a