

also feel that I can support the amendments to 830 which are now attached to this bill, and also the amendments and intent language that originated from LB 890 before. I also noticed that the Public Works Committee took a portion of the nitrate bill which I had before the committee and included it in this bill. The only difference is now there would be a penalty if a farmer didn't have a check well valve on the well in some place on the irrigation system to prevent pollution water from getting back into the well and polluting our water supply. Again I feel that with an effective educational program by the Natural Resource Districts and with the information that we have from the Engineering Department at the College of Agriculture we can come up and hopefully correct the nitrate solution situation that is now occurring. I feel that a double check valve is the answer to the problem. The committee felt that this is too drastic a move and that it would be too much in the way of regulations as far as the individual irrigators are concerned. So, again I will accept this amendment that is included in the present law. I do feel that again this can be corrected in the educational program and I am pleased that the Public Works Committee has a portion of this bill in it at the present time. I also feel that Senator Schmit's portion of 984 that were added to 643 are favorable. I feel that we do need to look into the issues that he addressed in 984, and as I understand it the State Soil and Water Conservation Commission is looking into these issues and will soon provide further guidelines for study on water storage, water transportation, diversion, transportation of water and stream flow regulation. I am hoping that in a year or two we may be able to come up with some legislation in these particular areas. I congratulate Senator Schmit with recommending this intent language and I am pleased that it is attached to 643. I am also pleased with the Public Works Committee for their patience and hard work. They have had a tremendous amount of time and work in this bill. I am hoping that with the debate today we do not drastically change it. I can see a couple of areas that we may have to change. But if they are drastic amendments to make further changes, I will definitely oppose them. One of the areas that I believe that we do need to change in is the improving of the definition of pollution. I do have an amendment that I will put on later to correct this definition. I am sure that there are other senators here that may have improvements to the bill. But once again if you are going to drastically change this bill I will very much oppose these amendments because I feel that what is currently contained in the bill is going to allow the Natural Resource Districts better capabilities and better facilities to work within the assisting of individual farmers and irrigators and at the same time we do not press regulations upon the farmers throats but rather try to work with the