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

February 7, 2006 LB 874

decide...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...how he's going to proceed. But I will proceed in any way he chooses. The ball is in his court. I do not believe that the original subdivision (e) should be done away with. As it stands, it's all right. It says, when the pesticide is detected in the ground or surface water, then more rigorous management practices may be imposed. That's good. That's all right, because you're not talking about the need to find a harmful effect. But the new language introduces the concept of a demonstrated adverse effect; therefore, the imposition of these more rigorous management practices should be mandatory. Mr. President, are there any other lights on?

SENATOR CUDABACK: There are not.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: There are none?

SENATOR CUDABACK: None.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then I will withdraw that pending motion.

SENATOR CUDABACK: It is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk, motion on the

desk.

Mr. President, Senator Kremer would move to amend, CLERK:

FA403. (Legislative Journal page 564.)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Kremer, to open on FA403 to LB 874.

SENATOR KREMER: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. This amendment is the ... identical to the amendment that Senator Chambers had earlier, that he agreed if I would want to submit that, that he would support it. It takes away all the new language on Section 3(e), and it reinstates the stricken language. And with that, we will be glad to work on something during the interim. I think there are... I know there are some changes that need to be made, when...the "shall" or "may," and the...and just a specific response, too. So we'd be glad to