

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

January 25, 2006 LB 32

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Wehrbein, on the Beutler amendment, AM1696, to LB 32.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I'd like to ask Senator Beutler a question, first of all, if I may.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Beutler, would you yield?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Senator Beutler, is this a bill, or has this had a hearing?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator, it's not a bill and it has not had a hearing.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Thank you. I suppose my heart is with what Senator Beutler is proposing, but it looks like to me it's going to be a great difficulty to move this issue forward in this manner. It seems to me also...it's my understanding NRDs could have stopped this themselves January 1, 2001. I don't know how the state can come in four years later, five years later and say you had to do that. It looks like to me the law was arranged so that it could have been stopped. It seems to me, as a nonlawyer, a court would say local control was what we've had in Nebraska for ground water. They didn't see the need or the necessity of doing anything about it at that time. In spite of the fact that as today we've got a problem, when it was able to be stopped or at least controlled it wasn't done. And for us to step in years later and try to control it, I don't...even though I probably would like to, I don't see how that we're going to be able to move forward and do that. And I was trying to look at some analogies to some other places. We were discussing liquor licenses in our committee, the Government...or General Affairs Committee. We can't stop liquor licenses simply because there's a saturation at this time. I don't know how we can come in several years later and said, oh, we allowed too many wells; now who's going to...who to suffer the pain? It looks like in our