

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

May 3, 2005

LB 117

felt about the bill and how we felt about the alterations to the bill that would be represented by the two amendments. The first amendment I have withdrawn, and this one I will also withdraw. But having had a long and serious debate on this matter, let me say that I don't withdraw it believing it not to be the right thing to do. I'm more or less where Senator Chambers is on this bill, in the sense that it represents a small step forward. Senator Chambers might say it does nothing at all. Certainly, when the penalty is only an infraction on the one hand, and for the seller, only a \$50 fine,...one of the principal reasons that you have fines and penalties...nothing is going to happen, because we've made everything so small. So if you leave the...I wouldn't leave the bill the way it is. If you can't make more of it, then it seems to me like we're inconveniencing consumers in the ways that Senator Chambers has described, and we're inconveniencing businesses in ways...some ways that haven't even been described on the floor yet. And sometimes we're inconveniencing both of them at the same time. When you put something like a product behind the shelf...behind the counter, it inconveniences the consumer who can't find it, it inconveniences the pharmacy who has to make time to go back and get it for somebody, it inconveniences manufacturers, and more than inconveniences, represents a distinctive competitive disadvantage if they're competing with a product that's in front of the shelf. So if you're going to have all these consequences, then it seems to me that either you have no bill at all, because it's just not worth the balance...the cost when you balance everything, or you move ahead and try to have something that's really effective in terms of an information system. In Oklahoma, they have the law. Their Bureau of Narcotics says down there, and I want to read this again: Woodward attributed the effect of the law there largely to the requirement that pseudoephedrine buyers sign the logbooks. There is no sense passing an anti-meth law aimed at reducing in-state production on the drug, he said, without a logbook requirement that mandates retailers track purchases, and gives law enforcement a record of buys. That wisdom, which seems commonsensical to me, is also the wisdom that's being...that has been adopted in Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. They all have logbooks. Now, there has been some discussion about a hand log. There has been some discussion about a central database.