

please stand and be welcomed by your Legislature. Thank you for being here. Senator Beutler on the Dierks amendment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Crosby and members of the Legislature, just to respond briefly, with respect to the bankers. I have been in touch with the bankers for the last year or so asking them continually are there any problems with 108. Is there...are there any changes you want us to make? And throughout that whole period of time and to date, we have not had any suggestions from bankers. And I think that the reason is clear. What bankers want is stability. That's what bankers want most. And the question for them always is which scenario or which way of doing things is likely to create long term the most stable agricultural society, and I think their answer is that this bill, that the implementation of this bill in our troubled areas is most likely to smooth out the situation and create a situation where everybody can still get loans. If we do this and if we do this far enough in advance, that hopefully best management practices is as far as restrictions go. I mean, nobody can promise that. Nobody knows what needs...what will need to be done exactly until we do research to create a situation that's level and long term and stable, but this is our best hope. The best hope is not to let things just go willy-nilly, however politics takes them or however nature takes them, because there's a lot of instability therein. If you have a court decree and the court forces us suddenly to do something with respect to Kansas, what stability is there in that? There is huge instability in that. In the Upper Republican, where they're dealing with water for other reasons, do you think the bankers see much stability in a moratorium on new wells out there? I'm sure they do not. That's very unstable, but it's become necessary. But it might not have been necessary if there had been more foresight in looking at all these different things. It might not have become necessary. They've done a valiant job out there trying to patch up the situation, but they started late. They started late and that's a mistake we don't...we should not want to repeat. The greater stability is in addressing things early. There's nobody out there that wants to shut down ground water users. Why would anyone want to do that? Why would an urban person or a rural person or anybody with the least care for the state of Nebraska want to do that unnecessarily? Nobody wants to and I don't think that we should be overly concerned about that kind of conspiracy or that kind of desire on the part of any significant