

May 8, 1981

LB 252

here. It talks about the economics of ground water recharge. One sentence out of there says, "This means that a major policy issue posed by the ground water mining problem is how to manage the available ground and surface water resources to provide for economic stability over time." We are talking about the economic stability of the State of Nebraska. We are representing the State of Nebraska as State Senators, and yet by turning down all the proposed amendments, by passing LB 252 in its present form, we are ignoring large sections of the State of Nebraska that will, in fact, have to have some additional water if we expect them to continue to irrigate as they know it now. Many people have stood up on this floor and fought for storage projects. Many people have stood up and made great and glowing speeches about how the people of the State of Nebraska expect us to deal with the water problems. Many people have mentioned the water problem is the major problem in the State of Nebraska. Yet we are willing to pass LB 252 in its present form. We are willing to do it without any amendment. As a matter of fact I get the feeling that the majority of this body would have liked to have done it on consent calendar, (interruption) important issues.

SPEAKER MARVEL: You have thirty seconds.

SENATOR VICKERS: I remind you one more time, this is a very, very important bill. It is going to affect not only us today but generations to come and it is going to affect them in its present form in a very disastrous fashion. I object very strenuously to the passage or the advancement of LB 252.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Dworak, do you wish to speak to the motion?

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President and colleagues, I will be very brief. The bill has been debated very extensively. Each amendment has been given very serious consideration. I think the bill is close to perfect. It is good legislation. I am just a little bit disappointed, however, at Senator Vickers' allegations of provincial viewpoint on this bill by district. I looked very closely at the map that he passed out. I see vast areas of white. I see areas of blue. I see areas of red, and really about the only specific voting pattern I have noticed seems to be a concentration in the red area. So I have a little bit of a problem accepting the accusation that we are looking at this from a narrow perspective. I think the consistent attempt to treat both basins under the identical criteria doesn't make sense. Circumstances are different for each basin. I think as a State Senator, as a representative of all of the people in