

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

March 3, 2004

LB 962

SENATOR CUDABACK: The motion was successful. The amendment has been adopted. And I do raise the call. Mr. Clerk, when you get time, next motion.

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Chambers would move to amend with FA1518. (Legislative Journal page 852.)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers, you're recognized to open on FA1518 to FA1502 to LB 962.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, once again, this is an amendment which is straightforward. But it is something that I'm going to have to perhaps discuss with Senator Schrock. If you turn to page 1 and look in line 12, you will see the term "potential reduction of flood damages." I think what they mean to say is the reduction of potential flood damages. We are not interested in potentially reducing something. We are interested in reducing that which potentially may come to be. So what I am doing is moving that word "potentially." I am moving it from before the word "reduction" and placing it before the word "flood." It currently reads, in this list of things that the Legislature is going to provide assistance to have accomplished, one of them is the "potential reduction of flood damages." I think it should say the "reduction of potential flood damages." And this is where I have to ask Senator Schrock a question.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Schrock, would you yield to a question from Senator Chambers? Senator Schrock.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Yes.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Schrock, this amendment that I'm offering is in line 12 on page 1. And instead of having the word "potential" in front of the word "reduction," I think it should go in front of "flood damages." So my amendment would strike it where it exists now and put it instead in front of "flood damages." Would that...does that meet with your