

April 16, 1981

LB 252

SENATOR VICKERS: Well, well...but I am also striking another section. I think it is subsection 2 that talks about the adverse impact, because I think the adverse impact, Senator Dworak, would be taken into consideration by all the other language that we are telling them to look at.

SENATOR DWORAK: Okay, Senator Vickers, then your only reason for striking section 2 is redundancy of language.

SENATOR VICKERS: Yes, I think it is redundant because of the fact that all the other criteria would naturally be causing them to look at how it might adversely impact, and I am suggesting that by putting the beneficial use language as far as the basin that is asking for the transfer obviously that would allow some looking at the impact in that area also.

SENATOR DWORAK: Okay, the new wording would be the new section 2?

SENATOR VICKERS: That is correct.

SENATOR DWORAK: Okay, Mr. President, I would like to call for a division of the question. The first portion would be section 2, which is striking the existing wording and inserting "the beneficial uses to be made of the proposed interbasin transfer", and the second portion of the question would be the striking of lines 13 and 14. Could I have a division on the question and debate then each portion of the amendment, Pat?

SENATOR NICHOL PRESIDING

SENATOR NICHOL: Senator Dworak, that is divisible.

SENATOR DWORAK: Do you understand...am I making myself clear as to where I want it divided?

CLERK: Yes, I think so, Senator. I will come back and check with you, but I think so.

SENATOR DWORAK: Okay, thank you. I would request unanimous consent for division of the question.

SENATOR NICHOL: Is there any objection? If not, so ordered.

SENATOR DWORAK: And then we will debate the first portion first and the second portion second, right?

CLERK: Yes. Senator, may I, Senator, then if I may, Senator,