

May 12, 1981

LB 243

not seem unreasonable to say that when we have limited property tax dollars, when we have limited state dollars in our resource development fund, and when federal dollars are being cut back, that maybe we at the State Legislature have to express some priorities. And I think the priority that Senator Schmit is saying is that if a project is 90 percent recreation, the project is 98 percent recreation, if a project is 100 percent recreation, it should not receive these tax dollars, that there must be some other benefits, flood control, habitat, water storage, soil conservation, that must be in there at least 25 percent. It seems a reasonable position. It seems a moderate position, and it seems a responsible position as far as controlling the capital construction costs that may exist in water projects at a time when dollars are scarce. I don't believe that we can say that we have the money to fund every water project no matter what benefits it provides. Somebody is going to have to establish some priorities and those priorities that I think Senator Schmit is demonstrating seem very reasonable.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Koch.

SENATOR KOCH: Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. Chairman, you have had three people speak in favor and two against, I would like to speak against before Call of the House, please, or before cease debate.

SENATOR CLARK: All right, I won't accept the question yet.

SENATOR KOCH: Well, Mr. Chairman, in that case I will exercise my prerogative which was I was recognized before Senator Haberman.

SENATOR CLARK: Well.....

SENATOR KOCH: I didn't know...usually you say, are there five hands, and then we are going to make that determination.

SENATOR CLARK: All I am going to rule is that I don't think we have heard enough on both sides yet.

SENATOR KOCH: In that case then, Mr. Chairman, may I exercise my prerogative to speak on this bill?

SENATOR CLARK: It is.