

April 10, 1981

LB 243

jumps right in there whether you want it there or not. It is there. And my problem is this, if this bill passes, I am really concerned that it is going to be very, very difficult to build projects in the future and that is why I am troubled. I hate condemnation. It is a gun in the back. We all know that. Without it we couldn't do some of the things we are going to have to do and that is what bothers me. Consequently I will have to support the kill motion and Senator Schmit knows that. I have talked to him about it and so he is not surprised. I cannot support the bill and I do support the motion to indefinitely postpone. Thank you. Now, Loran, you can turn my light off if you want to.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Hoagland.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I would just like to make a couple of additional remarks because I was not able to finish my thoughts entirely this morning about some of the ramifications of LB 243 which concern me particularly. Now, as I was indicating earlier, you know, none of us are experts and it is awfully hard for us to know what recreation benefits mean, or flood control benefits or how those computations are made, but I do know that the closer you get to an urban area because of the population areas around and the number of people in that particular part of the state, why the recreation benefits calculus automatically goes up and it is my understanding that by excluding recreation as a grounds for condemning land, it is going to make it virtually impossible around the urban areas where we are in such dire need of recreation facilities anyway to be able to have any projects undertaken pursuant to these condemnation authorities. Now, Senator Kremer made very well a point that I intended to make and that is I think we can trust the locally elected NRD boards. Let's let them make these decisions. They are locally elected people. They are going to act responsibly all the time, basically, and I think an argument Senator Lamb raised before lunch about the urban areas being able to impose their will on the rural areas and take land away from them by condemning them for recreational purposes is incorrect to this extent. It is going to be that locally elected NRD in that rural area that is going to make the condemnation decisions. So I really don't think that is a fair argument, unless of course, we are talking about the Papio NRD which does include the urban area in Omaha but that doesn't extend very far away from Omaha. Now earlier I talked about how we can't really understand what all this means because we don't know how these computations are made. Now I would like very much to call your attention to