

January 20, 1982

LB 375

going to pump the aquifer out in 30 years, 50 years, or a 100 years. My goal is to have it forever, and that can be done in my estimation, but it certainly can't be done with the malarkey we are talking about this morning. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Beutler. The question has been called for. Do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record the vote.

CLERK: 7 ayes, 14 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: The motion fails. The Chair recognizes Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, this is really kind of a funny situation because it is a trap situation and it goes like this. On day one they offer amendments that say, here is the cup and it is full, you can never do anything to tamper with the cup. And we say, well that is unreasonable because this is a resource, we are trying to manage it and use it and you take away all the tools and say you can't touch it essentially forever. And we say, that is ridiculous. And they said, aha, you don't want to make it so that the cup has to remain exactly the same forever, then we will offer you the other side of the coin, in other words, a complete repudiation of that. We will say, okay, you can use up the cup in 20 years, 30 years, which is not our goal either. Our goal is to maximize the cup, the aquifer as long as possible. Now can you imagine being on record here in the next few minutes voting to say, okay, we just all agreed this morning after 15, 20 minutes of debate that we are going to use up the Ogallala aquifer in 30 years, or 20, whatever the prevailing mood of the moment is. It is absurd. What is in the legislation is that we are going to manage that resource and as the technology and times change, we certainly hope we will make it last forever with management and use and control. But we don't want to play the games of, aha, you can never touch on one side or on the other, go to it, take her away. I repeat, it is a trap type situation and I think it takes away from the legitimate issues in the water debate and I think it makes it impossible. If you have some very legitimate amendments earlier or later I think it makes the credibility gone on those too. I wish you really hadn't done it this way because as I say I think it destroys the chances of any legitimate amendments you might have. It is a trap type game and I don't think it is right.