

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

March 2, 2006 LB 856

ASSISTANT CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Chambers would offer FA525. (Legislative Journal page 855.)

PRESIDENT SHEEHY: Senator Chambers, you're recognized to open on FA525.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President and members of the Legislature, this is found on page 1 in line 18. I would strike the words "on one premises," show that language as being stricken, since it's in the original existing law, and insert "at one location." I'd like to ask Senator Kremer a question.

PRESIDENT SHEEHY: Senator Kremer, will you yield?

SENATOR KREMER: Yes, I will.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Kremer, have you had a chance to look at this amendment?

SENATOR KREMER: Not really. I guess it looks okay to me, just on the surface. And I don't know...I didn't know you had these amendments coming up and I was busy talking to somebody else all the time, so...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, and they're not of that much consequence, but I'm not trying to slip anything by, so I'll give a little explanation of why I'm doing this.

SENATOR KREMER: Okay, that would be good.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: The language says currently, and this is in the existing law, "Hatchery means hatchery equipment on one premises operated or controlled by any person." I would strike the words "on one premises" and put in their place "at one location." This language that exists now may not have ever created a problem, but it doesn't really strike me as being appropriate. I don't know whether the word "premises," as used here, is like a collective noun that is the same, singular or plural, but if this is designed to be a singular word, because there is one premises, then if there were two you'd have to say,