

March 17, 1992

LB 306

everybody says, yes, yes, we must come to terms, and then we start to come to terms, they claim confusion. But there's no confusion here. I think it's clear what this bill does. It's very clear what this bill does and what it doesn't do and I think to put it off, to bracket it is to simply close our eyes to our responsibilities. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Madam President and members, I reluctantly rise to support the bracket motion and I...and I know sympathy doesn't do Senator Beutler any good, I understand that, and then he shakes his head "absolutely right", but I think its right, we spent the last month in here debating taxes and it's hard to shift gears back to water law and 306 is probably one of the first bills, at least the first couple bills, well, the banking was the first one I ever moved on a voice vote, which is amazing by itself, cigarette bill we could all understand, unfortunately LB 306 is a bill...a very precedent setting bill and it's one of those things, I'm not going to sit here and say it needs more study, I'm not going to sit here and say that it's a sneak attack by Senator Beutler, 'cause it's not. I mean, he's been very clear his intentions, as he said and Senator Wesely said, since 1978, there needs to be some changes in our water law. But the one thing, you know, the biggest concern that I have, as Senator Elmer already touched on, when you talk about on page 5 the recharge shall mean the correlation between surface water and groundwater, that concerns me greatly. That's one of those things that and, Senator Beutler, I can't tell you exactly what I think that's going to lead to, but I can tell you I think it's going to lead to something I don't like. It is that simple. Obviously, this bill in its more original form. Talked about, you know, granting permits within a mile or two from any sort of tributary, not knowing what the tributary was. It's one of those things that I am con...this bill, on its face I may not be that opposed to, but the precedent that it's setting is something that I'm very concerned about that I don't know where we're going. And, Senator Beutler, you're absolutely correct in saying we can't be afraid of the future, but I guess I am afraid of the precedent this bill, by itself, 306 sets. It's not a sneak attack. It's been very clear what Senator Beutler and others want to do, but I think it would be unwise for the body at this time to make that decision. I know I don't want to make it right now and am I passing the buck? I guess, yes, I am right...as a matter of fact, I am. I'll support the bracket

10631