

my amendment is not adopted? One-third of the shore line, at least one-third is lost to the public. The attorney admitted in a meeting that public access would be restricted if this land was not condemned and put into the entire project. So what they are doing, and Senator Schmit said the other day, said, "You shouldn't condemn one man's property for another man's recreation." And I say it is not right to take a lot of people's money to make one man rich and this is what this will do. It will make this man very wealthy because he has already plotted the land into lots and intends to sell them for cabins. So what my amendment says is if you pass the bill, and I am not debating the merits of the bill at this time, fine, that is all right, but my amendment says it cannot be retroactive. You cannot go back and attach it to something that has already been started and developed and money spent. And I ask you in the spirit of fairness to say that this is not correct, that we do not go back. We do not pass a law that affects and harms people who have tried in their best interest to make an area a recreation area for the benefit of all of the people in the State of Nebraska and that you support my amendment. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Newell, do you wish to speak on the motion? Okay, Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, of course I oppose the motion by Senator Haberman. I think, in fact, it is a reconsideration and if I wanted to extend the process and delay it and drag it out I would ask for a ruling on that but I think I would just as soon discuss the amendment and let the chips fall where they may and not concern myself with whether it is or not a reconsideration because it is only a matter of changing one word and then we would not have to do it. Now Senator Haberman speaks in some emotion about the private contributions. Let me tell you this. When the funds were originally solicited no private land was to be taken. Some of the people out there who contributed money to that fund said they did not know and, in fact, had been told that there would not be the taking of any privately owned land. If they had known it they would not have supported or they would not have contributed money to the fund. Number two, there is no shore line lost. No shore line is lost under my proposal. The shore line is still available to the public. There is absolutely no shore line lost. Number three, Senator Haberman goes to some length to explain about the nine, almost \$900,000 or \$891,000 of development fund money, public money he refers to it that has gone into the project which he implies will be lost if my bill becomes law. Not true but most important, I want you to understand this. That almost \$900,000 represents almost