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

February 7, 2006 LB 874

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the If you will look at this amendment, you will see Legislature. that it affects the area that Senator Beutler has On page 16, in line 22, I would strike the words "continues to demonstrate" and insert the word "demonstrates." The reason I'm doing that may be obvious, but I will put something in the record anyway. If a pesticide is harmful to human beings or the environment, once that determination is made, that should be sufficient to trigger this more rigorous It should not have to be an ongoing harm because this language, as it stands, does not make any reference to the level of harm, whether it could be lethal, whether it could merely cause a serious ailment or simply diarrhea or coughing. Anything which adversely affects the health would be covered by this language as it exists now. But I don't think it should have to be an ongoing harm, because that could be construed to mean that before any rigorous management...any more rigorous management occurs, some kind of study or statistical analysis covering a period of time, a number of people, collecting medical records and reports of exactly how many individuals suffered this harm, on and on, and it could be a self-defeating proposition. I'd like to ask Senator Kremer a question or two.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Kremer, would you yield to a question?

SENATOR KREMER: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Kremer, it is not the intent of this language to create a set of circumstances where once an adverse effect is determined to exist it is allowed to remain in operation until some kind of study, survey, or whatever is undertaken which could require an amount of time. That's not your intent, is it?

SENATOR KREMER: No, no, that was not the intent at all. And I...could I explain (inaudible)?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Sure. That's...I don't want you to just have to say yes or no.