

to do that when the two waters are handled so differently? That is what the conjunctive use issue that the state water planning and process hopefully will address. They are right in that respect. We are not ready to address that issue yet. I'm not addressing that issue. What I am saying with this amendment, very simply, is that when underground development is going to effect surface water in that area where the underground development is taking place as it relates to the use of surface water for present or for foreseeable interference with present or reasonably foreseeable uses of surface water in the district or reduction or loss of subirrigation within the district. I can assure you that this is not an attempt to put the Natural Resource District's in the business of regulating the amount or the use of surface water. It is putting them in a position where they can address the underground water usage if, and remember this is all this section is permissive. It is permissive as far as the Natural Resources District is concerned. I was a little bit surprised at Senator Lamb saying that it should come in as a separate issue, a separate bill next year. I can assure you I probably will, Senator Lamb. But, because of the fact that this wasn't in the statutes is probably the reason the control area was turned down up in that area last year. Now you have got a bill that would have a vote of the people and that is certainly all right with me. But, it seems to me that since there is a correlation in those two waters in the sandhills and in the area south of North Platte that I represent and since the use of underground water certainly affects that surface water, then the tools should be in the statutes to allow the local people through the Natural Resources Districts to address that situation if they so desire. It is that simple. If we think that any of the bills that we are going to process this year other than perhaps the one that would allow the people to make the vote of the people and make the decisions themselves, if we think that any of the other bills are going to address the concerns of the people in the Nebraska sandhills, we are just kidding ourselves because it is not. It is not. I repeat the concern of the people in the Nebraska sandhills is how the use of underground water is going to affect their wet meadows, the surface water, if you will in that area. For us to completely ignore that correlation of those two waters, I think is wrong. When we know that there is a correlation, we know that is the concern and it seems to me that we are at that point and time where we should put it in the statutes and let those local people use it if they so desire. Mr. President, I would urge this bodys adoption of this amendment to LB 146.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Motion is the adoption of the Vickers amendment. All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. The Vickers amendment to LB 146. Have you all voted? Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President, I guess I'm going to have to ask for a Call of the House and a roll call vote.