

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

May 19, 2005

LB 117

not that be child abuse? Should that be child abuse?

SENATOR FLOOD: If we're going to focus on the relevant issue here, and that is making meth, "placed in cooking" is not...is a diversion from the real issue, which is meth. I don't think we have a...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But on its own, you think cooking...see, now you've got it before you in statutory form. You want to remove cooking a child from the realm of child abuse. Is that true?

SENATOR FLOOD: I think that it would...cooking a child would be prima facie evidence that you're a child abuser, and I'm not necessarily concerned it's a statewide dilemma at this point.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now...

SENATOR FLOOD: However...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, I'll accept that.

SENATOR FLOOD: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Good answer. You said prima facie. When you look, as...let's go by what Senator Synowiecki pointed out, when you look at the circumstances under which meth is being cooked or manufactured, is that not prima facie evidence, if a child is there, that child abuse is occurring? The very circumstances under which this occurs, if a child is under...in those circumstances, isn't that more in fact than prima facie evidence, but it's at least that, that child abuse is occurring? Isn't that true?

SENATOR FLOOD: I think, given the fact we have 93 different counties and 93 different county attorneys, that may not always make it into the complaint, and the idea here, by adding specific language regarding the manufacturing of methamphetamine, addresses the very point that Senator Aguilar is trying to accomplish, and that is get these kids out of these homes and make it a crime to cook meth around children.