

Hoagland. (Read the Hoagland amendment (2) as found on page 376 of the Legislative Journal).

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Hoagland.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Mr. President and members, I don't want to take a lot of time on this amendment because the arguments are essentially the same as the previous one. This amendment says what it says. It says that if a management area is set up by a natural resource district and a management plan is developed, when they start imposing their controls, they cannot permit more than one-thirtieth of the total life of the aquifer to be used in any one year. Now it seems to me this is pretty minimal. Thirty years is one generation. If you vote in favor of this amendment, what you are saying is that you want the water in the aquifers in the State of Nebraska to last at least one additional generation, 30 more years. Now, frankly, I have a great deal of difficulty seeing how anyone could oppose that. If anybody is against that, I would be more than happy to attempt to respond to their remarks. I mean are you really against asking the NRDs to be sure our aquifers last at least 30 years?

PRESIDENT: The chair recognizes Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, Senator Hoagland said he had difficulty understanding how anybody could vote against this proposal. I have even more difficulty understanding how anybody could vote for it. What Senator Hoagland is doing, and I think this is the problem we haven't realized for a couple years, is he is reflecting the type of thinking he has been applying to water legislation all along, and that is, well, look we will just treat the underground water resources like, well like a building in Omaha, like a new house. We build it, we say we want it to last 25 or 40 or 50 years and if it is destroyed, fine. That is all we are shooting for. That water was put there by God and unless we use the system that we have got in the legislation already of trying to maximize it in conjunction with efficient use of it and taking into consideration changes as they develop whether they be recharge, whether they be new dams, or whatever, trying to make it basically a thing forever, preserved forever from pollution but also something that can be used. But I think, as I say, you are seeing laid out on the table maybe for the first time the real problem in water legislation and it is if you watched that last vote and the particular individuals that voted for it, it is that certain individuals in here have perceptions of