

your second half of the amendment?

SENATOR VICKERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, yes. Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, again I would simply point out to you that the future beneficial use of the district or of the basin of origin is protected under subsection 5, line 17. Senator Schmit pointed out the fact that there should be more storage facilities in certain areas of the State of Nebraska and, therefore, he opposed removing the "reasonably foreseeable future" language because there might be some more storage facilities built in certain places. Let me pose this to this body, we are state representatives. We are elected by district but we are supposedly supposed to look at the benefits of issues that we delve with as they affect the State of Nebraska. Now is it to the best for the State of Nebraska and for the taxpayers of the State of Nebraska to talk about building storage facilities, new storage facilities on some of the rivers of the State of Nebraska that might have additional water, like in Senator Schmit's area, Senator Dworak's area, although I am sure they don't want the dam on their land, or on their place or in their town, close enough to go fish in perhaps, is it better to do it that way or think about doing it that way? Or is it better to at least think about taking some additional water that might be in those areas to areas where the dams are already at, reservoirs are already built, the land is already bought, but there is not enough water to fill them up? That is the decisions we are going to have to be able to make in the future. That is part of the decision we are making right here this afternoon. Shall we build the Midstate facility, or shall we even just put it on the books so that we will never take any water out of the Platte River because we have got that on the books, we might talk about building it some day, that some time in the future? Or shall we be honest about it and say that that is probably not going to be built because of environmental reasons and various other things, costs, therefore, would it be reasonable to assume that maybe we should take some water where it might not damage too much, take some water out and put it in a reservoir some place that is already built, already there, no additional cost? Now if you are conservative, I would assume that you would think, gosh, it would be a pretty good deal to use something that is already there instead of building more. Or if you are opposed to using eminent domain for taking farmland away from farmers, maybe you would say, gosh, maybe we better just go ahead and use the lake that is already there and we don't have to take any more farmland away from anybody, we don't have to damage the environment any place any more than it's already setup, the environment is already changed. Well you and I both know that those projects are