

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker and members, we had a great deal of discussion on Section 2 of the bill already, what this amendment what it would simply do is simply strike Section 2 of the bill altogether even if it was then amended because if you look at that section, and I've asked that of Senator Beutler and I still do not understand why you need Section 2 to make the rest of the bill work. As you can see there is a great deal of discussion as to implications of that. You know, in some ways I think Section 1 concerns me too, but nevertheless, we can leave that in, but I think just for the sake of making of clarity for the sake of increasing my already somewhat small comfort level with this bill right now, I think the body would be wise to totally strike Section 2 from the bill. Then we can...you know, on the physical side of things you decrease most fiscal impact, you still have some items in the bill that are at issue, that are questionable, but this time for the sake of moving forward, I would ask the body to simply strike Section 2 in total from the bill.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Moore. Anyone wishing to discuss the amendment by Senator Moore? Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I think that what Senator Moore is seeking to strike, first of all, I suppose...I suppose it is appropriate, but basically he is seeking to strike only one small sentence. The amendment that we just adopted essentially struck everything in Section 2 except the phrase that reads, and this is the amendment we adopted, this is the only thing left in Section 2 that Senator Moore now seeks to strike, so basically he is striking the amendment we just adopted. The only thing left, it says, the water of every natural stream within the State of Nebraska including the Missouri River is hereby declared to be subject to appropriation. And I definitely oppose the amendment because I want to make it absolutely clear that a water supplier can obtain that surface water and can appropriate it. That's the only purpose to that one little sentence. But if you strike it, then in my opinion you have undermined the whole bill and I think you ought to play fair with the concept. If you're against the concept, vote against the bill. If you want to seek further clarification on that issue, I will in good faith seek to clarify it. But I want to be absolutely sure that what