

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

January 29, 2004 LB 172

Chambers amendment, Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members. I don't think I'm going to support the Chambers amendment because, frankly, Senator Chambers, I'm not convinced of the grammatical rule that says we should change "for" to "to." Now you did this on another bill and I didn't say anything, but I guess I need to know what your rule is in order to know whether you're right or not.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Is that a question, Senator Schimek?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: It is.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers, will you respond please?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, the rule I follow, Senator Schimek, is that the correct preposition ought to be utilized in a sentence. And to use "for" in the location it is with reference to the way it is being used is incorrect.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: They are both prepositions, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, it's like...the only way I can do...the only thing I can do is give an analogy. We would say so-and-so is subject to be called for jury duty, not so-and-so is subject for jury duty. It's subject to it. That probably doesn't convince you.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: In that case I agree with you, but not in this case. And I was just curious, Senator, about the rule about that particular...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, Senator Schimek, some things become...

SENATOR SCHIMEK: ...grammatical phrase.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...some things become habitual. For example, people will say a person is oblivious to something. But you're not oblivious to it, you're oblivious of it.