

May 8, 1981

LB 252

legislative body sees the need of the water in the State of Nebraska instead of being selfish and have a selfish motive in their particular basin. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: We have 20 third and fourth graders and 13 sixth graders from East Butler, Brainard, Nebraska. Joan Petrzilka and Mary Lou Meister are the teachers. Four adults are with them, in the North balcony. Would you raise your hands, please? Welcome to the Legislature. The next speaker we have is Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I am going to be very brief because I don't want to repeat everything that was said yesterday. On the other hand, I don't want to leave you cold but let's just review very quickly what the amendment does, in my opinion. As compared to what is before you in the bill right now, the amendment would have the effect of shifting the advantage slightly in the direction of the basin of transfer and against the basin of origin. Secondly, let me remind you that the amendment involves a new concept and that is applying these public interest criteria that we set up, not only to interbasin transfers, but to water that is taken from a river for use within the basin. So in that respect the amendment goes far, far, far beyond the original bill and although that is something we want to do eventually, I think it is something that does require and should require a great deal of study and I think if you adopted this amendment now your constituents would be demanding from you shortly, an explanation of why this was done without a public hearing and without their input. So I would encourage you, for those two reasons again, to defeat the amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Wagner.

SENATOR WAGNER: Mr. Speaker and members, I oppose the Vickers amendment. I think one of the things you really need to look at, it just completely changes the course of the bill. It takes out Section 4 in there that talks about river basins. It takes out some of the definitions. It is a different concept and it evidently was not discussed at a public hearing. We spent a great deal of time on this bill so far and I think we just kind of back and forth with amendments. I am very much opposed to it. I don't think this is the time to add amendments like this. I think the bill is basically not too bad the way it is and I would be willing to withdraw our other amendments if this amendment is defeated and I would say that if this Vickers amendment is put on, I will try to amend that amendment further and it is going to take some more time. I think we ought to defeat it now and go on with the bill. Thank you.

4785