

April 10, 1981

LB 243

everything that comes to the floor of this Legislature.

SENATOR CULLAN: Okay, thank you, Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: We grand....

SENATOR CULLAN: Thank you. I appreciate very much your explanation. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would have to rise to oppose the Haberman amendment and I think those of you who voted this morning on Senator Labedz' amendment or concerns about the liquor bill would have to take, if you plan to be consistent, would have to take the same position. What we said this morning on that bill was that we were going to change the law and it would have the effect of affecting the litigation between the Liquor Commission, I guess the State of Nebraska, and Falstaff but what Senator Haberman is saying now is that the law should only apply in the future and that we shouldn't affect this change in policy that we are making as far as recreation projects are concerned should not apply to cases which have not been finally and completely litigated. I think that is very inconsistent. If the philosophy of LB 243 is good, and I believe it is and evidently most of you do, then I see no reason why it should not be good for a case that is currently pending and I hope that you would reject the Haberman amendment and advance LB 243 and be consistent in our application of these philosophies and concepts.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Hoagland, your light is on. Do you wish to speak to the Haberman amendment?

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Briefly, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER MARVEL: We have got one, two, three, four, five, six, seven speakers. You have the floor.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: I would just like to make a couple of brief remarks in support of Senator Haberman's amendment. Now one of the most troubling concerns I have about LB 243 is that this entire piece of legislation essentially is a response to one particular situation. Now when a seventy-five percent amendment went on this morning, why that essentially allows the Willow Creek project but blocks the Oliver Project. Now before the lunch hour I talked about the Singleton family and the fact that they have been resisting the eminent domain proceedings for the Oliver Project up in their part of the state. Now, you know, the Singleton family went to the locally elected Natural Resource District and objected to the project and