

and they are under the south balcony. They are Craig Gundersen and Kevin Dasher, who are UNL students. Would you please stand and be welcomed by the Legislature. And also we have guests of Senator Withem. We have 47 fourth graders and their teachers from Tara Heights School in Papillion. Would you folks please stand and be welcomed by the Legislature. Thank you for being with us. Next speaker is Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members, I'll briefly express my opposition to raising LR 27. You know when I first heard about this proposal, it was a good laugh. I thought that the concept to try to come in here, and if you read the resolution, you can't help but have a chuckle out of it I don't think, trying to go through back to the 1919 Constitutional Convention and construct from a hodgepodge of statutes and constitutional questions and studies that were conducted or maybe not conducted over the years and call that a comprehensive plan is a joke, and I'm being real frank with you here. There is not a comprehensive water plan in this state, and to try and call the various statutes that we have on the books and very actions that this resolution cites in here a comprehensive water would be like calling a turkey a swan, a skunk a cat and a weasel a mink. You can call it what you want to but it's still the same thing. It is a series of statutes, and studies, and what have you, but it is not a comprehensive plan. You know we can try and put whatever moniker we want on the proposal but the whole intent is once again to try and bypass some activity that I don't think we feel that comfortable with. Obviously, having FERC involved with trying to settle our disputes in Nebraska, I don't think anybody likes to see the federal government intervening in a heavy-handed fashion in the area, but at the same time the solution to the problem isn't trying to misname a situation that we have in not having a comprehensive water plan, it is rather to address the issue. Try to come up with a comprehensive water plan, try to work on the issue, try and bring the parties together and negotiate out a solution. That's the issue that needs to happen, not once again trying to circumvent the intent of what we're facing. We have a barrier. We have a roadblock. Is the idea to try and dodge around it and find a way around it instead of meeting it head-on and trying to resolve it? Seems to me that's exactly what we're doing here. I understand the concern and the sincere desire by the parties that bring this resolution forward, but I see very little value to it and, again, if you have a chance to read it, I find it not a very serious effort to try and put a name on something that