

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this question is not a new one. It was discussed yesterday by Senator Hoagland and some others who tried to amend the bill in the intent section and I think what Senator Schmit and Senator Warner are talking about does make some sense. Of course, we don't want to talk about water running out in thirty years, we don't want to talk about a finite time frame and leave a legacy for our children and our children's children that no water will be available for them so I can agree that we want to allow our water to last for as long as possible, for eternity, if possible. But that is exactly what was proposed yesterday. Senator Hoagland had some language that was proposed in Section 1. We talked about in the Public Works Committee what we wanted to do in this bill and what we tried to work out in committee was the concept of sustained yield which would say that we sustain a yield from that aquifer that would maintain it for eternity, that would not decrease the amount over a period of years that eventually we would not have water available for our future generations in Nebraska. That was rejected in committee. It was rejected on the floor yesterday and that is what we have been hearing from some of the Senators opposing this amendment, that we shouldn't be talking about a finite set of years in which water should last, we should be talking about keeping it for everybody forever and talking about every other option we have to sustain the yield from that aquifer. But they can't have it both ways, they can't be against the amendment yesterday to do that and against this amendment today which is a much more modest attempt to try to keep up the water for at least that period of time. What we are talking about is a minimum number of years, thirty years. I would like to see our water last forever and I voted for and supported the efforts yesterday to try and put that into the law. We didn't get very far on that, didn't get very many votes, and yet today that concept is what is being espoused by these same people that opposed that effort yesterday, inconsistent, in my eyes, I believe, and I would believe in most of your eyes if you have looked at both of those issues. So I really think what Senator Hoagland is proposing is a very modest minimum target figure and I think what we really want to try and get at is the sustained yield concept, that we don't take more out of that aquifer than is recharged, that we don't take out more than that aquifer can sustain itself at so that eventually we don't run out of water in this state. I think that would be totally unfair for future generations and Nebraskans but in a way that is exactly the direction the state has been taking in many areas of the state. We have been talking about southwest Nebraska. That is always the one we point to first. That, obviously, has got some