this amendment. But if you oppose this and oppose that concept, then you are being inconsistent in my eyes and I think not fair to the future of the state.

PRESIDENT: We are ready then, Senator Hoagland, for you to close on your amendment to the amendment.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Mr. President, the debate on this issue, on this amendment, has reminded me of that game that kids used to play where somebody whispers a word in the one ear and then it gets whispered around the circle, and by the time somebody tells you what...by the time the word gets around to the originator, it is a totally different word or phrase than what was originally put out. By the time Senator Schmit and Senator Warner and Senator DeCamp got around to arguing this amendment, I didn't recognize it. It was a completely different amendment than what is up there on Pat's desk. Indeed a member of the press came up to me about five minutes ago and said, "Now wait a minute. Your amendment says at least, doesn't it?" And I said, "Yes, it says at least." Now let me refresh your recollection as to what the amendment says as opposed to what people here are claiming that it says. If you turn to your bill book on page 5 and look at the section up at the top that defines ground water reservoir life goal, you can see that that language is set out very much in the terms that Senator Warner would like it to be set out. It says that the individual NRDs after considering all of the evidence and all the data have to arrive at an aquifer life goal which shall last a finite or an infinite period of time but it has to set a goal, after considering all this evidence and all the factors that Senator Warner suggests. All my amendment says is that when it comes to setting that infinite or finite life goal after considering all the evidence and all the factors, why that aquifer life goal has to be at least thirty years. It cannot be less than thirty years. That is all it says. It doesn't say anything more. It doesn't say anything less. Now Senator Dworak is really in a better position to close on this amendment than I am because his remarks I think have been exceedingly effective and I hope you will think back on what he said. This is a very, very serious problem and this is a very serious amendment, and if this Legislature votes down this amendment, it is going on record as saying as far as we are concerned, the NRDs can set a five year, ten year, or twenty year life goal. They can use the water up tomorrow as far as we are concerned. We are not going to put any minimum standards in the bill at all. Now I really think that we are being snookered by the proponents of this particular bill. I mean yesterday we were