

down the drain. We think that while this bill, LB 146, is certainly not solving all of the water problems in this state, it is a modest start. So I urge you to defeat this amendment, pass the bill as the Public Works Committee has brought it out of committee and we will make one small step forward in attacking the water problem in this state. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Kahle.

SENATOR KAHLE: Senator Vickers, could I visit with you a bit? With your short amendment you are still talking about the pollution of water, are you not?

SENATOR VICKERS: Not necessarily, no.

SENATOR KAHLE: What does it do then?

SENATOR VICKERS: It talks about quantity.

SENATOR KAHLE: Your amendment has nothing to do then with water quality?

SENATOR VICKERS: Not my amendment, necessarily.

SENATOR KAHLE: Directly?

SENATOR VICKERS: No, not directly.

SENATOR KAHLE: Okay, that is what I wanted to find out. Because the other part of the bill does talk about pollution and water quality.

SENATOR VICKERS: Well the next section. The section that I am amending is Subsection A of Section 3, Subsection D is where it begins to talk about pollution. Then the new language that the committee has in 46-658.

SENATOR KAHLE: Okay, then that clarifies that part of it. The question that I have and I'm not sure that it pertains to this amendment. Has anyone diagnosed what pollution is yet? That is when I get up-tight about any of this legislation. We hear about that there are so many parts per million of nitrates in the water for instance in the Grand Island area I haven't had anybody tell me yet whether that is a critical level or not or whether we can live with it and for how long. I guess I would be worried about putting in statutes just that vague language about pollution for the NRD's to decide what they thought might be pollution. I'm sure that this doesn't relate to the Vickers amendment so I'll quit and talk later perhaps on this issue.