

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

February 7, 2006 LB 874

restricts us from doing that at all, so I would support your amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, thank you, Senator Kremer, and it shows that our minds are running along similar paths, because I had been talking to the Speaker and I may have missed some of the details of the discussion.

SENATOR KREMER: That is scary.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. (Laugh) Thank you, Senator Kremer.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. On with discussion of the Chambers amendment. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Kremer, let me...let me clarify certain things with regard to how this paragraph operates, because I think the paragraph, as it operates as a whole, should be considered in the discussion that we're having. And it says the state management plan and pesticide management plan may, may impose progressively more vigorous pesticide management practices. So with regard to the new language that you're adding, even if a pesticide demonstrated unreasonable adverse effects on humans or the environment, the department may still refuse to impose progressively rigorous pesticide managements in those situations. Isn't that accurate?

SENATOR KREMER: I would say yes.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator.

SENATOR KREMER: Yes, I think so.

SENATOR BEUTLER: I can understand the "may impose," if you're talking about the existing language, which was ground water and which allowed the department to act in an anticipatory fashion; that is, to act before the adverse standard was met. Giving them the flexibility of "may" gave them the necessary judgments they could use in different situations that were not yet situations where there was a clear adverse human or