

May 12, 1981

LB 243

that they didn't want any part of the Salt Wahoo Watershed, so they convinced Senator Stryker to put an amendment on the bill as the vote of the people so would that large area go. Well, it so happened that Saunders County voted out of the Salt Wahoo Project and the drive was led by a newspaper man in that particular area. Now I just had word a couple weeks ago that that newspaper man said that was the greatest mistake we ever made. We could have had our area developed today but we have nothing in the Wahoo Creek because we didn't want to face the issue. Now what I am afraid of that this bill is going to do the very same thing. I don't feel that Senator Schmit realizes what he is really doing. If he would say a hundred percent recreation I would go wholeheartedly with him, but when you break it down, you are in trouble.

SENATOR CLARK: Your time is up.

SENATOR SIECK: Thank you. I ask you to not vote for this bill.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Cullan.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I rise to support the legislative bill 243. I do so at the risk of disagreeing with Senator Kremer who told me that if I disagreed with him one more time this session, I would be in the woodshed, but maybe I can have Senator Schmit to defend me. Seriously, Mr. President and members of the Legislature, we have debated this bill extensively. I think it is a good proposal. I think it is only appropriate that we consider recreation as a benefit but it is highly inappropriate to build facilities whose only beneficial interest to the State of Nebraska is recreation. Our primary concern ought to be storing water for other purposes and not simply for recreational value. I know that we have debated and discussed this bill at length and so I will only raise one more point. I called my Natural Resource District about LB 243 early on in the legislative session I visited with the Manager of that Natural Resource District, John Williams from Chadron, and I asked him about LB 243, and he indicated that they did not believe that they needed the power of eminent domain generally but they certainly did not need it for a project which did not have as its main purpose a function other than recreation. And so my own Natural Resource District, which does plan to use some of the funds that we are appropriating, does not believe that recreation should be the main purpose for constructing a facility. Now it's pretty hard for me to understand if my own NRD takes that position, why their state association