

PRESIDENT: The motion prevails and the debate has ceased and I believe the question has been divided and, Senator Schmit, do you want a last word on your...?

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, members of the body, I believe that in this body tradition has its place. It has historically proven to be a good policy. Tradition, subject and rule all dictate that the two bills that we are discussing here now go to the Public Works Committee. To do otherwise is to break that tradition, to break that public policy with no advance notice to anyone. The members of the Public Works Committee have a deep interest in those bills, that is why they serve there. I do not want to offend anyone. I sincerely have the deepest confidence in everyone. I have total confidence in Senator Beutler's integrity and in his desire to improve the quality of water in this state. I know the Ag Committee has the capability of hearing those bills, but I want to point out, as has been the case before, I am not breaking tradition. I have never taken a proprietary interest in these issues. I did not object a year ago when the 463 type bill went to the Ag Committee. I think it might serve a good purpose for those issues to be debated by the two committees. But I want to point out this that when the issue is a narrow one, should Ag and Environment consider this issue or should the broad public interest be involved? Senator Lundy, as a former city manager in Kearney is well aware of the impact of agricultural chemicals of course upon the city water supply, but also recognizes the impact upon the city if industrial waste, if lagoon waste, if other types of waste are allowed to contaminate that resource. Senator Lowell Johnson is an engineer. He understands those things. He understands what happens in Bellwood, Nebraska can certainly have an adverse impact upon the water supply of the City of Lincoln. It has happened in the past. It will happen in the future. The industrial waste, the chemical waste, the nonagricultural waste exceed without exception, I'm sure, those of agriculture. The reason the bills were heard as they have been in the past was because it was felt that the Public Works Committee had a broader perspective and that perspective would encompass the wishes and the interests of all the people rather than the more narrow issue. It has served well. It has served admirably and it will continue to work that way. But if you change the bills this morning and send them back to the Ag and Environment Committee, you