

told we can't have an infinite life goal, that just won't work. Earlier today we are told we can't have a hundred year life goal. Now we are told we can't have a minimum thirty year life goal, whatever we come in and propose. In committee, of course, we were told we couldn't have a sustained yield concept like Senator Wesely talked about a little while ago. Whatever we come up with, no, it just isn't workable, we can't have it. You guys really don't understand the water issues because you are from urban areas. You haven't spent enough time studying it, and if you were as smart as we were, you would realize how unrealistic your proposals are. Well, of course, that is ridiculous. This amendment is very simple and all the obfuscation and all the attempts to make it sound more complex than it really is shouldn't work. Now let me get back to one of the essential points that concerns me about LB 375 as much as anything else. I hope you all understand that this bill has been written by lobbyists who are working for principals who frankly don't want government at any level to be able to deal effectively with our water problems. That is where this bill comes from and I know it is being promoted and it is being billed as being something very different, but the fact of the matter is it was written by people who have been hired by people that don't want government in any level to be able to deal effectively with our water problem. So that is the truth of the matter and this bill was not going to help. And what we are trying to do is put a couple of amendments in it that are going to strengthen it and make it work a little bit better than it is going to work right now. As indicated before, if this bill passes in its current form, it is going to be a setback, and granted I am from an urban district, and granted I wasn't born or raised on a farm, but by the same token I don't have a vested interest in any of these...in most of the issues related to water and I really think that putting in minimum language of this sort for the reason Senator Dworak and others have said makes a great deal of sense and at least we have that minimum protection that otherwise we will not have if this is not adopted. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Senator DeCamp, state your point.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, could I have the amendment, since it is not printed in the Journal, could I have it read so that I know and everybody knows specifically what we are voting on.

PRESIDENT: All right, the Clerk will read the amendment.