

on Page 6 of that information that would be required to make the decision as to whether we even need minimum stream flow legislation or not. It doesn't beg the question one iota. It just merely sets out adequate criteria so this body, so you Senator Wagner, Senator Cope, Senator Murphy, can make a decision when it's forthcoming. Now these are the two major points of difference...how the Commission is chosen. You either have the Legislature along with the Governor, choice one, or you have the Natural Resource Commission, choice two. You either have a complete study looking at all criteria, or you have another partial study that no one has any confidence in that doesn't result in enough information to make a decision. I strongly...strongly beg, urge and pray that you reject Senator Kremer's amendments, accept the amendment...accept 595 in its original form.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Cullan.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I rise as a member of the Public Works Committee and the minority on the Public Works Committee in opposition to Senator Kremer's changes, and I would like to...and I should say to the changes recommended by a majority of the Public Works Committee. Let me say that from the early stages, the members of the Appropriations Committee furnished the members of the Public Works Committee with drafts, with early drafts of their particular legislation on the intent language for the water planning process, and through numerous discussion, and on these particular points in this draft and on what the water process, the water study process was going to be, the Appropriations Committee met every single objection that I raised. I think that they eliminated some language which would have created problems in the water study process, and I think the language in the existing appropriations bill is one which will allow us to institute a very thorough water study process to proceed in a timely fashion, in an orderly fashion to meet our objectives. Now it appears to me that the Public Works Committee, the majority of the Public Works Committee, are arguing about a very insignificant, a very minor point in the entire bill, and in the entire process. Most of the objections have been met. The process we are in agreement on. I think it is improper and incorrect, I should say, to make such a big deal about such a small point. Now the Advisory Committee membership is going to be virtually the same irrespective of who makes those appointments. It simply, in my opinion, is not a major issue. One thing that does concern me is why the Public Works Committee makes such a big deal, and I'm a