

to advance the bill. The reason I did not vote to advance the bill was that I was not sure that this bill gave the basin of origin any protection at all. And it seems to me that it is necessary that the basin of origin has some protection. In other words, it does not make sense to me to transport water around this state unless you are going to put it to a better use after you haul it somewhere else. I think the basin of origin should have the opportunity to use this resource first since that is where it is to begin with, there is not the expense of transporting it to other areas. Now I might comment on the problem faced by some of our cities. Omaha, for example, I can never see a time when Omaha or any other large city will be deprived of the water that they need. That is just not politically possible. It is unrealistic to ever think that that is going to happen. They are going to get the water they need for all the vital functions of a city...of a bustling city. And this is not, I believe, part of the issue. I think that the people in the city can rest assured that the water is going to be there for their use. But what we are talking about primarily is the agricultural areas and it certainly makes sense to me to take care of the basin of origin before you start transporting the water. I think Senator Beutler's criteria that gives the Director of Water Resources some basis upon which to base his decision is sound. We may argue about some of the language in one or another of those, but basically he is on the right track. I think this is a necessary bill. I support the bill and I oppose the kill motion.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President and colleagues, I join Senator Lamb in opposing the kill motion, and the arguments that I hear raised in my opinion are ridiculous. The major argument I have heard in opposition to the bill is that there is litigation pending. And in my opinion whether we have the bill or do not have the bill one thing that is going to be assured probably is continued litigation. I think any request with or without the legislation is going to probably result in some court battles and court tests. The major purpose and the major thrust of the bill is to give some legislative guidelines to the Director of Water Resources and also the courts. In absence of these legislative guidelines, the issue becomes moot as far as public debate, as far as public involvement, as far as legislative involvement in the issue. If we do not pass this legislation and if we do not establish this criteria in statute, we totally abdicate our responsibility to the courts. We give the courts, in fact, an absolute blank check to do