

May 19, 1981

LB 243

CLERK: 26 ayes, 1 nay to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Schmit, do you wish to close on your amendment?

SENATOR SCHMIT: Yes, Mr. President. I would just like to say this. Senator Haberman refers to the fact that we can't change, we can't swith. We change every day in this body. We just witnessed it several times this morning. I don't think in the thirteen years that I have been here I've ever seen a bill that has come out of the Bill Drafter's office and hit Final Reading in the original form. Maybe Rex can pick one out and if he would, I would be glad to see it. There are also those individuals in here that take a certain pride of authorship and who refuse to accept any kind of a compromise on their bills and usually those bills do not wind up as law. I would be the first to suggest that rather than to have a bill stripped down to the point where it does not do anything that I would just as soon see a bill die. But I think this is an important issue. I believe the issue is important enough to all of us that we recognize that at some point in time we had better try to lay down some guidelines or we are going to have a very difficult time to explain why when we request from the General Funds, three million, six million, ten million dollars for water development projects, we refuse to adopt any guidelines relative to how the money will be spent. I don't think that Senator Haberman or myself could go back to our respective districts and argue to our constituents that every single dollar of the three million dollars in the water development fund should be spent for recreational purposes. Of the twenty-four Natural Resource Districts, only a small minority are desperately concerned about this issue. The question was raised many times as I travel across the state, almost without exception the managers and the directors have told me, we don't use the right of eminent domain. We rarely use it under any conditions. But we would not use if for the purpose for which some people claim that it is most almost necessary, the purpose for condemning for recreational purposes. Senator Sieck asked the question about the Oliver project. Senator Sieck, the Natural Resource District could come to the Legislature on that project if they so chose. It would be an avenue that would be open to them. I want to run through it once more. I'm not going to take a lot of time. There were objections raised as to why and how the determination would be made as to what percentage of benefits would be attributed to recreation. Under my amendment the Natural