

a technical amendment or a clarifying amendment, it always brings me up on the edge of my chair and I want to say, and I think that Senator Sieck touched upon it, Senator Kremer touched upon it, all of us would like to have the optimum but the optimum is not consistent with the reality of life. It is apparent to me that there are differences of opinion and we have had those for a long period of time but if you use the word "indefinite", you are, and we say consistent with beneficial use, whose beneficial use? Mine or Senator Vickers'? Senator Vickers' or Senator Beutler's?. Senator Beutler's or Senator Kahle's? The area is all encompassing and it must be addressed in that manner. Obviously Senator Beutler called your attention to the fact that he is concerned that if we pass this bill there will never be another control area, that we will use the management concept. Now the bill has been in place, the statute has been on the books for some years. At the present time we have established two control areas or three. Not exactly a galloping ghost as far as getting those control areas is concerned. Even though there are people who have insisted for a long period of time that there must be control areas, it is kind of interesting that the concept goes back and forth. If the local NRD wants one, then the local control concept is good and it ought to be done. On the other hand, if the local area says they don't want one, then it's bad. I think the management plan gives the flexibility based upon the language in the bill today to give the NRD the tool it needs to resolve some of their problems, not all of their problems, but some of their problems. You shall not achieve the optimum with this bill or any other bill and we have not promised you that. What we are saying is that it is a better tool than has been available to us in the past and I would suggest, as it has been suggested by others on this floor, that regardless of what we do that someone can find a method or a word that ought to be changed. If as Senator Beutler says it makes very little difference but it strengthens the statement, the debate upon the floor strengthens the statement. The debate here which addresses the issue and says we are concerned, the testimony before the committee, the individual statements by senators affirms and reaffirms our deep concern about the importance of water to this state. But water lying underground that is not being used, and I want to call you attention to those Thirties...(interruption)

SENATOR CLARK: You have thirty seconds left.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...that water did us no good. It was only when man used the technology available to him and the resources available that we converted it to irrigation water that it made Nebraska the great agricultural state that it is. Thank you, Mr. President.