

February 25, 1991 LB 67

have to do with threats to the water, directly. Well, that's like saying if you pass this amendment then the study is going to be skewed too, because all you'll study are the possible water problems. I think what we want to get out of this process is a comprehensive look at the whole situation and all the different kinds of problems that are involved, and I think, to do that in a fair kind of way, that this amendment is very premature. Now, it may be that after the studies are done and it comes time to actually implement the plan and empowering the Department of Environmental Control, you may decide that there are one or two types of dangers that are not sufficient to cause a reorganization of landfills in a particular area. I think then it would be appropriate to come back in and say we don't want to deal with this particular problem, it's not serious enough. But I think it's wrong to go the other way, at the front end of the process, and say the only thing we're worrying about are threats to water, because anybody looking at this in a comprehensive kind of way will know that there are other kinds of threats that are just as serious, or more serious, and that they should all be considered in this problem. And, you know, we've talked about the importation of waste problem, and this also relates to 67 and to what we're going to look at. We're never going to get some controls on the importation of waste, or find out what kind of waste is coming in, unless we first have a comprehensive system for regulating all landfills. So, I hope you'll consider not amending the bill with Senator Lamb's amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Beutler. I'll now recognize Senator Schmit, followed by Senators Lamb and Morrissey. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, I think Senator Rod Johnson put his finger on it, when you don't have any kind of a definite date you really haven't done anything. Those who object to the Lamb amendment ought to at least be honest enough to concede that you can't do any less than what you're doing with the committee amendments. The DEC can't do one single thing to Arnold, Nebraska until December 15, 1993. And, if Arnold decides to send in a plan on that day that says we're working on it, that's good enough. Well, they've got to approve it or disapprove it. Suppose they disapprove it, say we don't like the plan? There is nothing in the amendment that says you're going to fine Arnold, Nebraska, or Bellwood, Nebraska \$500 per day until a plan is completed and approved, nothing