

February 12, 1992 LB 306

SENATOR BEUTLER: Do I think that a court would interpret it to be a domestic use? Right off hand, I don't know what the significance of that would be. I mean, I think that they are going to interpret the Constitution. We're not amending the Constitution so whatever they have defined domestic use to be previously, or whatever they would define it to be under the Constitution, they will define that independent of any statute that we will put in place. I mean, maybe they will look at some of the statutes that we put in place for guidance, but as you know, already in case history in defining the word domestic use they have pretty much limited it to the water for the use of human beings for drinking water and for sanitary purposes and the feeding of livestock.

SENATOR ELMER: Thank you, Senator Beutler. I understand that that is the case. So the appropriation that might be had for an instream flow to recharge a water field for public water supply...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR ELMER: ...I think could easily be interpreted as for domestic use since the majority of that water would be for that purpose and would conceivably then have a superior right over any appropriated water for agriculture since domestic use is first and maybe be rightly so. But it is a consequence that we all should be aware of if we go ahead and pass this bill on further and it deserves a great deal of thought. I do know that the people of the state do deserve good drinking water and that these types of well fields are very good for that purpose, but I would suggest that along with this type of a bill that we're considering we also should consider...

SPEAKER BAACK: Time.

SENATOR ELMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll put my light on again.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Elmer. Senator Schmit, you're next. I do not see Senator Schmit. We'll go to Senator Robinson.

SENATOR ROBINSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I have a question for Senator Beutler.