

February 24, 1982

LB 375

in agriculture, and maybe listen a little more to the farmers that are working on the bill. Thank you.

SENATOR HEFNER: The Chair recognizes Senator Hoagland for closing on his amendment.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Thank you, Senator Hefner. You know, once again there have been a lot of accusations thrown around about that this is a wild idea and an impractical idea. Senator Schmit says this represents land use control, if Hoagland wants to use land use as a method, why doesn't he say so. Well, you know, I don't like to go around waving lists in the air because it reminds me of the late 1940s when Senator McCarthy was waving a list in the United States Senate, but let me do take an opportunity to wave one thing in the air right here, and this is the comments and recommendations of the Natural Resources Commission. I mean, there is nothing wild or impractical or off the wall about this. We have a four-volume study here that we spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of state funds to complete due to Senator Kremer's leadership. And let me read you what the Natural Resource Commission says we ought to be doing...the reason the Natural Resource Commission essentially is the father of this amendment. It says that alternatives 8(b) and 8(c) in the report here deal with the controversial issue of whether groundwater allocations should be based on the irrigated acres or irrigatable acres. The commission believes this issue should be resolved at the local level rather than by the Legislature and therefore opposes both alternatives. Each NRD should be able to decide for itself whether to base allocations on the irrigated or irrigatable acres. Each NRD should be able to decide itself. Now that is what our own rural oriented agriculturally dominated Natural Resource Commission says the law should say. That is what this amendment does. This amendment doesn't represent land use control. If this amendment represents land use control, why then the Groundwater Management Act represents land use control because under control areas Natural Resource Districts have always had the authority to allocate on any basis they want, not only on one basis of irrigated acres which Senator Schmit in his speech conceded favors one kind of irrigation system, favors one kind of development over others. Now this is a reasonable proposal. Senator Vickers' memorandum which he distributed earlier makes it clear as to how the small farmer who has 3, 4, or 5 quarter sections of land, and I misspoke earlier, I meant to say quarter sections of land, would be prejudiced and would be forced to install irrigation systems if he wants