

that...I think it's wrong in the thinking that we're going to totally devastate irrigators in Nebraska. Thank you.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Thank you. Senator Bohlke.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Yes, Mr. President and members. I've been listening and I think it's important for the rest of you who have not heard some of this debate and some of these issues that the Natural Resources Committee had an opportunity to listen to that you understand, and certainly I think what Senator Avery said as far as when we get to the surface water rights, those are protected in the constitution. No matter if you believe in correlative rights or not, you really can't do anything that would do something to the constitutional rights of surface irrigators. But it does get at part of the problem that we've discussed when you recognize conjunctive use and you bring the two together and I think possibly that you'll hear later in the debate on the grandfathering clause, how do you protect the ground water irrigators that say surface water irrigators will have first-in-time, first-in-right. We have...ground water irrigators have correlative rights. When you bring the two together in law, are you not giving more protection to surface irrigators than ground irrigators? And that was part of the discussion in early debate in the Natural Resources Committee. Then came the grandfathering amendment that I think later, and maybe on Select File, we'll have a chance to discuss in more detail. But I think it's important to understand those differences. And, Senator Elmer, I know I've listened to your response to Senator Dierks and I listened to what Senator Beutler said about a problem in the Republican River currently, because part of my question had been earlier on, why not just do a pilot project? If the problem is in the Republican River area, why not try out 108? Why not recognize conjunctive use and try out 108 in the Republican River area and maybe one other area? But that's your area of the state, Senator Elmer. I don't think there was much support of that in the committee. Senator Beutler, from what he said earlier, I think says that we've let things get to the state that we're having a crisis situation and he believes with 108 that we would prevent that type of crisis situation in other parts of the state. I still think we could have tried it in the Republican River and one other area and have seen the outcome of 108 before we take it statewide. I'm continuing to listen to the floor debate and I think for those of you who have not heard some of the issues of