

not...I just can't accept that. So we put an amendment to the amendment up there that would strike the words, "Strike the original sections and all amendments thereto" on the first two lines. And it'd just leave the words, "insert the following new sections." It is my answer to dividing the question and I don't think we can divide the question. This amendment will, in essence, do that. So we would then add the new language in Senator Beutler's amendment to the existing LB 72, and I don't have any problem with that. I think that we need to let Kansas know that we have visited the issue again, and that we are not all that enamored with their actions down there, or lack of actions, and this gives us an opportunity to do that. So with the amendment to the amendment, we, I think, do strengthen the bill and I am willing to accept that. I hope that you will too. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Dierks. We are now on the Dierks amendment to the Beutler amendment. Senator Hefner, do you wish to address the Dierks amendment to the Beutler amendment.

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, I rise to oppose the amendment to the amendment because I think that the Beutler amendment is the way to go as he originally drafted, and this would have all the states that is in the compact, have them share the liability, and I believe that is the way it should be. This is a complex, very emotional issue. It has been with us for many years. I believe it started probably six or seven years ago, and what about community consent for low-level radioactive waste sites? Should we have it or shouldn't we do it? How far should we go, and that is a \$64 question. Okay, if we go with community consent on this one, how about relocating highways. We are having a lot of hearings, a lot of comments, a lot of disgruntled people now when they are trying to four-lane Highway 81, and bypass some of the towns. Also with US 275. I know there is some people at West Point and some of the other towns along 275 that are not very happy because the State Highway Department says they are going to bypass them. And they have had a number of hearings, so these people have had an opportunity to get their input in. How about building bridges? There is going to be a new bridge built across the Missouri near Niobrara. Do we let the people decide where that bridge should be built, or should we build it where the experts say that they can get good foundations and where it should be built? So I think we need to consider those things too. How about our power