

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

April 27, 2005 LB 117

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Bourne. On with discussion of the Chambers amendment, FA205, to the third component by the committee amendment, Senator Kopplin, followed by Senator Beutler.

SENATOR KOPPLIN: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I support this bill and I hope no one misinterprets that, but there are some problems with it that I have, and one is this 18-years-of-age business. I'd simply like to point out that there's many 17-year-olds that no longer live at home. They've graduated from high school, they're out on jobs and so on, and under this proposal they can't even buy anything for their allergies. And I...so I think 18 years of age is too much. I'm not sure I could agree with Senator Chambers that we need to eliminate it completely, but I think some consideration should be given to that age. Thank you very much.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Kopplin. On with discussion, Senator Beutler, on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Bourne, let me ask if you're open to some other ideas. Going to back to this point of sale restriction provisions, when you...when law enforcement...without a log, when law enforcement tries to enforce any of these restrictions, if they haven't stopped somebody out there and caught them with a large packet of pseudoephedrine or the other prohibited precursor, if they haven't stopped somebody out there, there's really no way for them to use any investigative techniques or to search other than kind of ineffectually walking around from store to store and seeing if any particular individual clerk remembers the same person coming in at different stores, or at the same store at different hours, or coming back day after day. And even if you...and if you caught somebody with some in their car, you still wouldn't be able to trace it back to a store and enforce this law in any effective way that I can see. And what would be the incentive for law enforcement to even try if the penalty on the seller side is just \$50 and the penalty on the buyer side is just an infraction? And I understand those are current law. But in many other parts of the bill where you already have