

can read it in advance. Muster the number of votes it would properly take, twenty-five, instead of trying to do it with simple majorities. Show that we are really sincere on this thing and make it fair to everybody to know what is going on. But I have been handed a copy of it now they have made. If any suit, in any suit instigated concerning the adequacy of a ground water management plan...no, this is another one...this is another one, still don't have a copy of that one but the way he read it I see it blatantly unconstitutional telling me I can't go to court on any grounds if they do something.

PRESIDENT: Before I call on Senator Hoagland to close and to reply to that, the Chair would like to introduce members of the top ten group of supervisors from Goodyear up here in the North balcony. Would you please be recognized and welcome to your Unicameral Legislature, people from Goodyear, welcome. Senator Hoagland, you may now reply and please close on your amendment to the amendment.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Mr. President and colleagues, this amendment was distributed to all of you yesterday. It was put on your desk yesterday and we have plenty of copies around if anybody would like to see it. Now I am afraid with Senator DeCamp we have played this whispering game again. Senator DeCamp emphasized the last five or six words of the amendment and left out the first three or four words that are controlling. What the amendment says is "The adequacy of the ground water management plan...", the adequacy, that is whether or not it complies with those thirteen subsections that are set out on page 5 and 6 that I called your attention to before "...shall not be subject to challenge...". Now let me take you back to all the lawsuits and all the newspaper articles you have read about the lawsuits involving the environmental impact statements over the past ten or fifteen years. I am sure Senator Schmit remembers very, very well the environmental impact statement litigation that held up the Norden Dam. I mean the Norden Dam might very well be built now, as Senator Schmit and Senator DeCamp know, if it weren't for the fact that every time somebody wrote an environmental impact statement somebody else could take it into court and hold it up for years. Now there is nothing about this amendment that prohibits people from filing lawsuits challenging the constitutionality of LB 375 or objecting to all kinds of other things the NRD might be doing. All this amendment says is that if an NRD has developed a thirteen point ground water management plan they can't be taken to court on the adequacy of that plan because don't you see that if everytime they develop a plan one disgruntled landowner in an NRD proposed management area