

SENATOR CARSTEN: And then that can be appealed to...

SENATOR SCHMIT: Yes, there is a provision for appeal through the district court system.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Is this very closely resembling the liquor store permits that we're having such a problem with?

SENATOR SCHMIT: Far be it from me to equate chemigation with such a dastardly thing as liquor, Senator Carsten.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Well, a little bit different ingredient I will admit, but the structure is very similar it seems. I just wanted some clarification on that.

SENATOR SCHMIT: I believe that the respons...the original responsibility, and I would like to have Senator Johnson comment on that, the original responsibility rests with the natural resource district. Is that not right, Senator Johnson? Would you comment, please.

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: Senator Carsten, I think Senator Schmit has explained it adequately. I think the responsibility that we try to provide was directed toward the local people and that local natural resource district because those would be the people that would be actually inspecting the sights. And we are hoping that having a more local control that we'll have better compliance.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Very good. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Senator Sieck, Schmit is next.

SENATOR SIECK: Mr. President, members of the body, I will support this amendment as it is at the present time, it is the bill, LB 284, the chemigation bill. I have a long history in this particular endeavor. When I first came here I tried to, and introduced a bill, the double check-off bill it was called. It didn't get very far because of a lot of things that was not in it, although we had a lot of support from the people out in the country, in the state, from every sector of our society. Two years ago I asked for a resolution, and I carried this resolution. I did some research in chemigation, what is happening, and what needs to be done. I had several people tell me shut it off, don't do nothing. I began to feel maybe that was what we had to