

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

May 3, 2005

LB 117

here at the time that what is now the Grand Canyon was really the banks of a stream running more or less at grade level, but that's what they say by way of explanation. So if I continue to speak against what is being done here, it may have some impact and it may not. Fortunately, there are people outside of this room who can listen to and observe what it is we say and do. Senator Beutler touched on something that I've been trying to underscore. You are definitely doing things to inconvenience and intrude, inconvenience and intrude into the affairs of ordinary people. That is being done, for sure. Nobody knows how many meth labs are in this state. Therefore, nobody knows how much meth is being manufactured in this state. People on this floor who want statistics on motorcycle accidents would not accept what is being accepted here. And with the motorcyclist with or without a helmet, that person is involved. You are not saying in order to make sure that everybody on a motorcycle wears a helmet, everybody walking down the street has to wear one, too. You're not saying that. But in this, the vast majority of people affected are innocent people bothering nobody, doing nothing wrong. They're not even conscious of the government except maybe on April 15. Then here you come, because some cops told you that 80 percent of the meth comes in, 20 percent of it is manufactured. How can they give you those figures when they don't know? How do they know? They don't even know how many labs are here. They don't know how much meth is produced in each lab. So how can they tell you any amount? Senator Stuthman even accepts that. Senator Aguilar accepts it. Everybody on this floor except me accepts it. You don't ask questions about your source of information and how you arrive at a conclusion. You know one of the things that makes science such a wonderful pursuit? A scientist who thinks he or she may have made a discovery keeps in mind the possibility that he or she could be wrong, that he or she could be wrong. So the supposed discovery is submitted to others in that field, the peer group. They evaluate it, they study it, they put it to rigorous tests because the goal is not to make this one who claimed to have made a discovery turn out to be correct. It's to find out if it truly is a discovery; and if so, is it the type of discovery represented by the one who supposedly made it? Hoaxes have been worked on the scientific community before, but nevertheless, if the rigorous...