

it's going to go through a very fine sieve. We have to do much sifting, at least I intend to do it. I was in my office this morning when the Speaker mentioned that we're not in crunch time yet, but we soon will be there, well, that was a mistake. This is a time when a lot of people eat breakfast and if they eat cereal, well, it is crunch time for them if they eat the kind of cereal that doesn't get soggy in their milk, but I know he was referring to something else. When these kind of bills are brought they generate a lot of discussion and if they move us to that point, that is one of the benefits that I think this legislation carries. It forces discussion, it forces analysis, it forces evaluation of what it is that a legislature ought to do. So in that sense and considering that, maybe Senator Jones did us a service by offering such a bill as this. However, once it has been offered, the service value has been dissipated. To recapitulate what he stated yesterday as motivating him to bring this bill, I will do very briefly. He indicated that there were two neighbors who had a dispute, I call it a trench, about a trench that went through the property of both. Water flowed through this trench. When the neighbor downstream did not keep the trench cleaned out water collected, as it will tend to do, and since it had no way to escape it went back the same direction from which it came. As a result, the upstream neighbor had some land that was flooded, became very offended about it and before he could get a decision in court resolving this, Senator Jones said that the downstream person contacted the corps of engineers. When they evaluated the situation they proclaimed that this indeed was wetlands and, as such, the protection that is accorded wetlands by federal legislation came into play. That, based on what Senator Jones said, is the reason for this bill. As happens so many times when legislators bring bills to us, there is not an understanding or there is an ignoring of the purpose of legislation. If a problem exists and the Legislature, by enacting a law, can address that problem in a meaningful way and if to address that problem is in the public good, legislation of that kind should be brought before us, it should be discussed and if it really is in the public good, it should be enacted. But when the person who brings the bill identifies a problem, lays it out in detail and has to acknowledge that the bill which is brought does not even touch the problem, that is the best argument against enacting that legislation and that is what we're confronted with by LB 168. The problem which arose as a result of a dispute between two private property owners will not be touched by any provision in LB 168. The dispute arose, not because of any rule adopted by