

responsible are looking at not just the picture in front of them. They are not looking at a television screen. They're looking at a set of facts. They're looking at history and they're looking into the future. They're not going to base their judgment upon the issue as of January 19, 1982. Now the thing that is disappointing to me is that we take an amendment like this which really has no substance and we spend some time on it and we debate it back and forth and we recognize the inconsequences of it and we say, well what the heck. But the point I want to make is this. It does nothing for the bill. It adds nothing to the bill. It is just a matter of time consumption. Now if you want to adopt that kind of amendment for the purposes of consuming time and eating up the clock, this is not a football game. There is no definite sixty minutes on this. We can go for sixty days. We've already used up a few and I have as much time as the next man but if you proceed along this manner of spending a lot of time on inconsequential amendments you will never deal with the substance of this legislation or any other. With that I ask you to reject the amendment and proceed with the next amendment and deal with it upon its merits.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Beutler, do you wish to close?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I don't very much appreciate having my motives impugned. All the amendments I am offering I am offering because I think there is a philosophic or a substantive or a technical problem. One of the techniques that we use in the Legislature when we know there are a lot of problems and we don't want to discuss them long, we start off at the beginning saying, things are technical, things are being stalled, and when people get tired then they don't look at them anymore, then they just start buying that argument but each one of the amendments being offered to you today does make a difference, would make a difference. This particular provision is clearly inconsistent with what we're doing in the rest of the statute. Now Senator Schmit says it is unnecessary but just last year or the year before the Lower Loup NRD was denied the right to create a control area on the basis of the distinction between present insufficiency of water and insufficiency in the future and we amended our statutes to eliminate that distinction and to get the thought about the future into the statutes, to get the ability to act on what is in the reasonably foreseeable future into the statutes. And all I am asking you to do is acknowledge that in this particular statement of intent. If you don't then