

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

May 19, 2005

LB 117

as soon as possible so that they can go to a home where they're not around meth and they're not cooking stuff up so that people can shoot it in their veins. That, that makes sense to me. And I will differ with Senator Synowiecki. I think Senator Aguilar is right by putting something specifically in the statute that addresses the manufacturing of methamphetamine. Maybe there's a better way to describe what we're trying to get to. When law enforcement goes and busts up one of these meth labs, that gives them another charge they can list on the complaint or on the citation or at bond hearing so that the judge is immediately aware that this wasn't just a manufacturer; this individual let his kids run around. And I think that we should require the law enforcement official or the county attorney to, you know, to specifically prove up what interaction children had with a meth making operation.

SENATOR ENGEL: One minute.

SENATOR FLOOD: That should be in the complaint against the defendant so that prosecutors make that case specifically. So I do support what Senator Aguilar and Senator Bourne have worked together to accomplish. I do think that a technical amendment may be necessary to maybe clarify what our intent is, but I think we're on the right path. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR ENGEL: Senator Flood. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Flood made some interesting observations, and I have to ask him a question or two.

SENATOR ENGEL: Senator Flood.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Flood, you had mentioned that maybe a technical language could...a technical amendment could clean up what I had pointed out. Could you tell me generally or briefly what that amendment might consist of?

SENATOR FLOOD: I would strike the word "in."

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Why? If a child is placed in cooking, should