

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

May 3, 2005

LB 117

can shut down 50 percent of the labs. First of all, they won't know whether they've done that, because they don't know how many labs are here. If you're going to establish some kind of statistic, you have to have a base from which you're working. If you don't know where you're starting from, you don't know where you're going or where you are. So the statistics mean nothing. But one thing is crystal clear. There is far more meth coming into this state than is produced here. Law enforcement is not going to be able to find any more meth labs as a result of this bill being passed--not an additional one. Since they like to use snitches to ensnare people who haven't done anything except irritate them, let them use the snitch network to help them find some of these meth labs. But in some instances, they don't want to shut them down, because as long as the public is in a panic, more money can easily be shunted off into this supposed fight against meth. They can put together all of these so-called law enforcement task forces with the esoteric names, and all of these letters that it takes to create an acronym for them, to give the impression they're fighting meth. So they might find a lab because it blew up. And you might see on television or in a newspaper picture seven or eight or a dozen law enforcement people from the U.S. Attorney for the District of Nebraska, through the town marshal, standing there with their little chest sticking out because a meth lab blew up and they found out where it was. And the public gets the impression that meth is being fought here. Untrue. We should not be a part of the misleading that goes on to the public. I know politicians are expected to behave that way. And when I say politician, I mean the stereotypical person, who is venal, who is not going to tell the truth, who is going to mislead, misrepresent, and then try to get a piece of legislation through that does nothing, while heralding and trumpeting it as the solution to a problem. This bill is not going to touch the meth problem. Why can I say that and not be successfully challenged? Because the people on this floor who know anything about that problem know that what I'm saying is true. That's why Senator Aguilar--and I believe he's as sincere as a heart attack--has to stand on this floor and make appeals that go in a direction other than showing that the problem is going to be dealt with. He of all people knows that this bill is not going to do anything of consequence. But you're bound and determined to