

the life span of these aquifers should be indefinite and there was great debate that that was not possible to determine, that it was impractical and so on. So rather than bring in a frivolous amendment, I think what Senator Hoagland is trying to do is find a compromise, a certain definite period of time that for a state policy we could say that we want to protect and preserve water. Now maybe some people think a 100 years is too long. That is probably three generations and maybe we shouldn't make plans for three generations in the area of water. But obviously we must be facing a crisis of at least one generation if we are having this bill in front of us. So someplace between 20 year life span and a 100 year life span I think we should establish a state policy for preservation of water. Now I don't know a lot about the technical areas, but I know that a lot of constituents come to me and say, what are you folks down there going to do about water? This seems to me the sort of thing that we can say that is a state policy we have established, a protection for a definite period of time in the State of Nebraska for underground aquifers. And, again, maybe a 100 years is too long. Maybe we should pick 50, but I think to pass a bill that enables an aquifer to be used up without some minimum guarantee I think would be imprudent on the part of this Legislature. It would be possible under this bill for the water to be used up in 5 years or 10 years and I don't think we want that to be the state policy. So I would hope that Senator Schmit perhaps could look beyond some of the personal considerations and some of the difficulties the bill has had in committee and on the floor and consider what is the wise public policy that this Legislature should establish. It seems to me a statutory minimum for water life in the State of Nebraska is a reasonable thing to do, and I think that Senator Hoagland's proposing a compromise between the Vickers' proposal received substantial support yesterday of an indefinite period. Well if we are willing to accept, some of us indefinite, I think a few more might be able to accept something less than indefinite, like a 100 years or 50 years. So I think that before this bill advances we should decide on a policy in the State of Nebraska for minimum life for an aquifer. And if Senator Hoagland's amendment is defeated, I would hope that we could come up with sort of concensus. I would hope that Senator Schmit would cooperate in this, some sort of concensus for minimum life for aquifers in the State of Nebraska.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Kahle.