the Natural Resource District in this particular area could not handle the functions that the groundwater conservation districts are handling now. I wonder, Senator Sieck, if you might be willing to address that?

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Sieck, do you yield?

SENATOR SIECK: Yes. Senator Cullan, I also was opposed to having the groundwater districts a part of the Natural Resource District, but after seeing the groundwater district in operation in this particular area, I have to admit and change my philosophy that they are doing their job, and if we tried to get the Natural Resource District in this particular area to do the same things that this groundwater district is doing, it is going to cost a lot more money than the Natural Resource District can ever come up with. So I feel this is the cheapest way and the best way to accomplish this, and another thing that I want you to know is that this board has addressed themselves for five years, and they requested this five years. They could have said, let's go on continually but they actually wanted just the five year limitation because they felt with this in mind they could step up their program and get this job done and the job in that area is so important and we need every tool that we can use.

SENATOR CULLAN: Thank you, Senator Sieck. I appreciate the fact that you raise the concern about finances. I understand that that really is one of the key concerns in this area, that the seven percent spending limitation and the mill levy limitation which we have on Natural Resource Districts is perhaps the main reason that you want the groundwater conservation districts to continue to carry on these functions. Of course, the lid will be expiring soon, so I am not sure we still have the same financial press to have these districts continue in operation. The Legislature, I think, needs to decide today whether we want to continue to have political subdivisions with the same functions to continue to operate. In this particular area, it appears that they are operating in harmony now but that may not always be the case and there may be a time when the existence of two political subdivisions with the same functions creates conflict rather than harmony and I see no reason for us to continue to have two political subdivisions carrying on the same function. I think that the Natural Resource Districts has this responsibilities now. If we take out the spending lid and allow the Natural Resource Districts to address these functions, then it would be unnecessary for us to continue with the operation of two subdivisions with the same function. So I would urge the Legislature at this point in time to oppose the continued existence of these