

serious problems and they are finding that some of their area is going dry. Well, I remember taking a tour down there that Senator Vickers graciously hosted a couple of years ago and I remember talking to a former Senator at that time about my concern for the fact that it looked like twenty or thirty years from now that that area was not going to be able to irrigate any further and I said that that was terrible, that we should have our water last forever, and we should not deny future generations the right to irrigate by not having water available. And that Senator said to me, look, we dryland farmed back in the Thirties and the Forties. We went to irrigation the last few decades and that was great. Those were the good times. But when we run out of water, we will go back to dryland and it was okay then, it will be okay now so what are you worried about. And this was an older gentleman and I was just stunned by that, the concept that we have had some real luxuries in the past few years, that we were able to irrigate, but the good times are now but they are not going to be here forever, and when we go back to dryland, well, that is not the worst thing because we used to have dryland and that was fine and we got by. Well, that is absolutely I think inconsistent and inconsiderate of the future of this state, that we should keep in mind the fact that if we have the benefits of irrigation which have really made our state flower, that we have become a garden spot in the world, not only our nation, that to deny irrigation possibilities for future generations is absolutely wrong. But this was the attitude at least one person had and I am sure it was shared by others and I believe at that point that I was absolutely opposed to that attitude, that we should try to maintain a sustained yield, not ever run out of water wherever we are at and talk about preserve and conserve...

PRESIDENT: One minute, Senator.

SENATOR WESELY: ...our water supplies in the State of Nebraska, and we all know this is a targeted problem. It is not across the state. We have had some areas where the water levels are rising so, of course, we are not going to be as concerned about that area, but at the same time we do have some areas where the prospects of in thirty years not having water around are viable, are possibilities that we should not reject, and so when we talk about at least trying to maintain them thirty years, I think that is what we are talking about. But for those who oppose this amendment, if you would come back at this point and talk about a sustained yield concept, about language that says we want to preserve our water supplies forever, then I would say that, yes, indeed, I can understand why you would oppose