

finger on, of course, the number one emotional aspect. If we were to adopt this thirty year proposal of Senator Hoagland's, every headline in the paper tomorrow would say we are going to be out of water in thirty years. This is exactly what the headline writers want, and as he said, that would not be a fact but it is what they would pounce upon and apparently that is what Senator Hoagland would like to have because it would give him another opportunity to berate those who as he says oftentimes waste the water. I think it is most important that we recognize under the present language of the law we can go for a sustained yield. It can last a hundred years, it can last two hundred years; the most recent study we have indicates that in two-thirds of the State of Nebraska under the maximum utilization of water you can't pump it dry. Now Senator Kremer and Senator Warner have pointed out there are areas that need recharge. There are methods available to us to provide recharge but in most instances the persons who are proposing this amendment are the ones who have also opposed recharge. They are the ones who have opposed the storage. In fact they are the ones who only last week voted to deny the urban legislator the right to vote. I would like to have seen that in the headline but I didn't see it. The point I want to make is this. There isn't any way, what we are saying here with the amendment of Senator Hoagland's is that if a man had a hundred thousand dollars in the bank, he says it will last for thirty years and then I am going to go get a job when my money is gone. What Senator Warner has said, what Senator Kremer has said, and others who have spoken here, Senator Peterson and others, is that we know we have this amount of money in the bank, but rather than to just use it up until it is gone, we are going to get a job now and go to work and we are going to try to add to it and supplement it and find other methods and mechanisms whereby we can make it last longer. I see the Hoagland amendment as being the absolute opposite of what I have in mind, of what Senator Kremer has in mind, and what I am sure this Legislature has in mind. There isn't any way, there isn't any way we can adopt that amendment and be consistent with good water policy in the State of Nebraska and I am confident that Senator Hoagland has to know that. There are areas of the state where we are going to have and we have water problems now but those problems are going to be resolved as Senator Kremer has said by that local action, by recharge, by development, other mechanisms, not by a statement in the law that we are going to maintain that for thirty years. It will not work. I ask you to oppose the amendment.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Wesely.