

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

February 7, 2006 LB 874

the Chair. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Stuthman. (Visitors introduced.) Senator Chambers, on your amendment, FA401.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Kremer and I and his staff were under the balcony discussing this word change. I would like to ask Senator Kremer a question or two, and he may not have the answer just yet because he may want to further explore it. But to the extent that he may have an answer, I would like to ask him one or two questions.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Kremer.

SENATOR KREMER: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Kremer, let me explain first what I see, and then I'll give you a chance to respond to that any way you choose without me framing a question that might restrict your answer. The only thing being dealt with in subdivision (a) is the imposition of progressively more rigorous pesticide management practices. That's all. If the word "may" is there, a determination could be made that there ought to be more rigorous pesticide management practices, but they don't have to be imposed. This language could be disregarded and there is no management practice which is more rigorous than the one that had been in place under which this problem developed. Senator Kremer, here is the question, and you can take whatever of my time you need to answer it.

SENATOR KREMER: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If a problem is found where there is a harmful, an unreasonably harmful effect on human health or the environment, and whoever is supposed to enforce this provision decides not to do so, what can be done in that situation to see that more rigorous management is undertaken? In other words, to simplify the question, if the problem is found and more rigorous management is required but it is not undertaken, with the word "may" being there how can that problem be addressed?