

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

April 27, 2005 LB 117

perhaps, it makes sense. We already have a statute that prohibits the possession of methamphetamine itself, and I think ephedrine, too, if I'm remembering correctly. But what we do not have is a statute that makes illegal the possession of pseudoephedrine, and the variation of that with a longer name, that we've been dealing with. And it seemed to me that it might be a useful tool for law enforcement, should they catch somebody with a car full of this cough syrup or these products that contain the precursors of methamphetamine in the marketing, or in the concoction that they make up. It might be good to use the possession statute, if they have in their possession quantities of those materials that could not logically be used for any other purpose than the illegal purpose. There is a statute--I should make you aware of this--with regard to having certain materials with an attempt to deliver, having methamphetamine with intent to deliver, possession with intent to deliver. So we've covered most of the bases. But we haven't prohibited the possession of these precursors with...in a large amount. So I set out an amount in the statute, which is five times as large as what you can buy in a 24-hour period, and indicated that possession of an amount in excess of that would be a Class IV felony, just as the possession of meth itself is. And it goes on to provide that this law wouldn't apply to bona fide businesses and persons in the pharmaceutical industry--manufacturers, transporters, wholesalers, or retailers, acting in the normal course of business, because of course, those people would have larger quantities of these items. I tried to think of any other situation where somebody might legitimately have a larger quantity, and that's one of the reasons why I'm bringing forth this idea, but I do intend to withdraw it. I need your help. Are there any other situations where a person could legitimately have large quantities of this material, and would it not be fair, even though these products in and of themselves are not prohibited drugs, they are drugs, they are materials that are used to make meth? And outside of the normal products that they're used for, there appears to be no legitimate reason to possess these items with the quantities of pseudoephedrine, for example, that we're talking about in the statute. So that's the idea, to try to make it...try to make the law tougher, but to try to do it in a way that's reasonable, and I'm interested in the ideas on the floor with respect to