

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

February 7, 2006 LB 874

to be addressed, ought to be addressed here. I thought you made a point worthy of my adopting, temporarily, your view when I wanted to strike the word "unreasonable." In order that you could have a clear understanding of why that word was put into the new language, you said you wanted to talk to the department. I think it ought to be stricken, but I agreed to withdraw my amendment to strike it so that word remains in place. Now I'm being asked, I presume, to let the bill go without striking the word "may" and inserting the word "shall." It makes no sense to me, since the new language you're offering has brought to our attention this subdivision (e), to do all of this activity that goes into making a determination that an unreasonable adverse effect is befalling human beings or the environment, and leave it optional as to whether anything is to be done about it. If this plan that you're talking about covers everything, we don't even need this new language, because the plan that you're talking about as covering it already does the job. It's obvious that the Department of Agriculture does not feel that any of those plans you've been referring to adequately cover the waterfront, or they would not have recommended this new language. Having recommended the new language, the original subdivision (e) has been altered and you're putting language into the law which is not there now. You're talking about the demonstration of an unreasonable adverse effect. That has been demonstrated. We're at the point now of not speculating and arguing, but there has been a demonstration...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...and establishment through facts that this unreasonable adverse effect is taking place. And yet, you want to leave it optional in the statute as to whether anything will be done about it. So the question I'll ask of you, will you be willing to strike the new language, reinstate the original language, and leave the law as it is? Then we discuss and argue about how much of this new language ought to be brought back into the bill. Would you be willing to take that approach, Senator Kremer?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Kremer.