

Natural Resource District to support it. They did not ask for it. The people of that community asked for it and I think we should assure them that they are going to get their money's worth. So I heartily endorse the Haberman amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Kremer.

SENATOR KREMER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I, too, rise in support of the Haberman amendment and I am not going to talk very long. I have tried to impress upon this body the dangers that I see in LB 243. Now the Haberman amendment, of course, has to do with the retroactivity of the bill. I have been concerned about that particular part of it right from the beginning. I am not sure that all of you have a copy from a letter sent and signed by a goodly number of citizens in that area including some of the top business people. It is rather an impressive group of signatures. Now why are these people interested in the Oliver Reservoir? It is not money that we are going to spend. It is money that has already been spent that we are concerned about. I assume that all of you have a copy of this letter or I would read the contents of the letter itself. I think it is explanatory and brings out their reasoning why the Oliver Reservoir as now constructed and now funded should remain as it is. The issue is in court for the second time at a higher court and perhaps we should wait and see what the court has to say. I could go on and on. It is not necessary. The hour is late. I just want to stand to my feet this morning and again give you my reasoning why I have concerns about LB 243. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. Speaker and colleagues, briefly I support Senator Haberman's amendment. I think we have got two specific issues and we keep talking and interweaving the two issues which appears to be blowing smoke and confusing the basic two issues. Number one is the issue of retroactivity which Senator Haberman is trying to address and, number two, is the issue of eminent domain which I think is what Senator Schmit primarily is number one purpose is to solve. I think I could support Senator Schmit's amendment on the eminent domain and the percentage between recreation and water. I don't really have any problem with that but I have some real specific problems with the going back on people that have already commenced something and I think that another problem that we have on this issue is trying to adjudicate the worth, the merit of certain project. I don't think I am in a position to do that. I don't think this body is in a position to do that. I think the Natural Resource Districts are and have had the authority to do that and if we have given them too much authority then let's change it but let's not change the rules in the middle of the stream. I think when we