

he had not been down in that area for many years. He also indicated that he does not know for certain where the boundary line is and I'm sure he's right and I don't think anybody else does. It's my feeling that a lot of problems that are arising out of the result of this issue could have been avoided if the two states had surveyed the area before talking about a settlement. To me, it seems kind of silly to agree to Missouri's proposal to survey the area after the bill is passed. If we don't really know where the land is, and we don't as has been suggested by the state surveyor, then it seems only logical that we should be putting some effort into surveying the area and I think that should be a cooperative agreement between both Missouri and Nebraska. The only surveys that have ever been done down there that I'm aware of are soil surveys. You know what soil survey are. They go out and survey the land to see what the type of soil is, and I can tell you some of those are quite revealing because the soil survey from Atchison County, Missouri, which was done in conjunction with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, does not include a survey of land that Missouri now claims to be taxed. In fact, even though Missouri has drawn the state line on these maps down the middle of the river, the map still refers to the slough that runs along the current boundary as State Line Slough, and the land on the east side of the river they claim to have jurisdiction over was not surveyed. To me this casts serious doubt of Missouri's sincerity about whether or not these lands are theirs or ours and I guess that...that anybody would have to agree with that. I don't have the...I didn't reproduce these maps to bring up to you. We do have photocopies of them and if anybody wants to see them my staff has them over here on the side. Finally, LB 719 does not propose a solution to the boundary dispute that has any permanency. What they're saying is they want to redraw the line on the boundary down the middle of the river, which I don't really have any objection to. Part of the problem of it is that we know that the river has changed over the years and could possibly change again and if and when that should happen we will be back... we will be back in here again deciding who the land belongs to if it...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR VRTISKA: ..(inaudible) one side of the river or the other and so I guess I don't think this is truly, in the long run, going to be the end of this dispute over the long haul. I'm sure there are a lot of other reasons I could talk about why