

year, the increased water resource fund by \$400,000 or what was actually spent this year. There is some six million dollars or thereabouts of previous years appropriations obligated but as of yet, unspent in the cash flow process. I rather suspect that this problem has been plaguing us for a couple-three years. I suspect that before we start adding more, that \$400,000 more or less isn't going to make that much difference, we are going to have to develop a much better procedure than we have gotten now. There was concern expressed in the past that the Natural Resource Commission through their obligational authority could commit the state to many millions of dollars by partially funding a given project. That potential is still there but the reason for what we did last time was to try to bring some control on that and there will be some kind of similar language this time that will establish limits as to how much of a future obligation the state might have. While I'm not arguing, would not argue against the use of funds for water for any purpose it remains a fact it seems to me that some approach better than what existing law provides is going to be necessary if the state is going to have any competent way of addressing how much funds to put in these in future years. The request, the potential request, are many millions of dollars. I think that we are going to have develop a better process than we now have as far as the legislature's concern in trying to arrive at an appropriate dollar amount to put in these funds.

SENATOR CLARK PRESIDING

SENATOR CLARK: Seantor Sieck.

SENATOR SIECK: I think that we have had enough debate. I want to call the question.

SENATOR CLARK: Do I see five hands? The question has been called for. Those wishing to cease debate will vote aye, those opposed will vote nay. Have you all voted? Record.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 2 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SENATOR CLARK: Debate is ceased. Senator Kremer, do you wish to close?

SENATOR KREMER: I'm not going to take a lot of time closing. Senator Dworak said that we have debated this, and we have, but not entirely. The amendment that we debated before asks for a million dollars of new money. We are not doing that here. All we are asking for \$400,000 additional money and