

adopt Senator Haberman's amendment the issue will become clear cut. It won't have this confusion. We won't have this whipsaw between one or the other issues and we can make a decision.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Hoagland.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I also rise in support of Senator Haberman's amendment. I think it is a very important amendment and I commend him for the speech that he gave, his opening remarks, I thought they were excellent and I commend him for wading into this controversial issue and stating his mind. Now I have two basic reasons and let me state those as succinctly as I can. First of all I think that the sunset amendment sponsored by Senator Schmit even more clearly points out the real nature of this particular bill as I understand it and that is a bill that is designed to serve one project, the interests of one family, one set of individuals in their particular part of the state who don't want their land to be condemned but instead want to be able to profit off of the continuation of this project to use their property up there along the shore line. And I think that the fact that the sunset amendment has been attached indicates that the proponents of this bill are not as interested in the long range policy effects of this as they are on putting the kibosh on this one particular project. Now I don't think in this Legislature we should let special considerations of that sort influence our judgment. Now the second major concern I have is with the bill as a whole and I think that the reason I am so worried about it is because I come from the eastern edge of the state and I represent part of a metropolitan area that is in upwards of a half a million people and I think that frankly no one knows the effect that this 75% cutoff calculus in the bill is going to have on recreation projects around the Douglas-Sarpy County area within a hundred or hundred and fifty miles of this metropolitan area of about a half a million people. I would ask Senator Schmit in his closing to tell us if any other states or if the federal government used this approach, this approach of saying that a project cannot be built if the recreation benefits are beyond a certain percent, here 75% the way it is written in the bill right now. Now any projects around a large metropolitan area are necessarily going to have a large recreation calculus just by virtue of the fact that there are a lot of people there and I think frankly we do not know the effects that this is going to have. I mean I would ask Senator Schmit if he knows if the retroactive effect of this bill which Senator Haberman is trying to strike out is going to affect any other projects that are on the drawing boards in the Pappio Natural Resources District or any other NRDs in the eastern part of the state. Is this going to mean, for instance, that if we have a project now on the drawing