

opposition for a bill of mine. I would most certainly not seek you out because of your known position. I did look at your amendments. I did not feel they had substance and so I did not accept them. But you did not ever contact me personally and ask me if I would consider them. Now at this point in time your attempt to place in the statute a goal of 100 years is not acceptable to me and I do not think it is acceptable to the majority of the members of this Legislature if they read the entire bill from cover to cover, because you immediately begin to pick away at the concept of the bill. I would ask the members of this Legislature not to vote for the amendment, to reject the amendment and then to deal with other substantive amendments which may be offered, and I will deal with them one by one or any way you want to. But remember this, remember this, there is always a danger when there is a rash of amendments, 15, 20 or 30 amendments, that the good old boy syndrome comes into play, and we'll say, well, give so and so an amendment. By giving in on a certain issue with thorough knowledge of what it will do to the bill, you stand to jeopardize a very finely tuned piece of legislation. There are other bills on this floor that are going to give you other opportunities to work in the area of water development, and Senator Hoagland has a number of them. I would suggest that if I were to take the approach that sometimes has been taken on 375 with Senator Hoagland's bill or anyone else's bill, that I would not be considered to be in good faith. I am not saying you are not in good faith, Senator Hoagland, but I am saying that this is not the time and this is not the place to redraft the bill which has been around for more than 1 year. There was an opportunity in the Public Works Committee and you sat on that committee. You did not take advantage of it then. You have had all summer long to discuss it with myself and Senator Kremer. It has not been done. Now you suggest....

PRESIDENT: One minute, Senator.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...that this is the time and the place to place in the statute a definite length for reservoir life. I suggest that it is not proper. It should be rejected. It is not in the best interest of the state, and I ask the members of this body to vote against it.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President, I would disagree I guess with the tone of Senator Schmit's statements. Yesterday's debate Senator Vickers proposed an amendment that said that