

allow reasonable transfers where the water is not being used. I guess it is all a question and we are all trying to decide this of what is, in fact, a balanced policy. It is my feeling with regard to the Vickers amendment that it would make the bill a very strong pro transfer bill. He adds the language, "the beneficial uses to be made of the proposed interbasin transfer". I have no objection to the addition of that language, in fact, I think it is contained within subcategory 1 anyway. But it's what is crossed out that is serious. "Any adverse impacts of the proposed interbasin transfer and use." Well if you are not going to look at the adverse impacts, you are wiping out a large part of what you should be looking at. The second thing that is deleted is the phrase, "any reasonably foreseeable future beneficial use of the water in the basin of origin". So that means if the basin of origin isn't right at this moment, at the moment of the application, using the water, then they are out of luck. If that is the way you want it to be, that is fine, but I think maybe we should be looking at at least the immediate future of the basin of origin because some of that investment in those valleys, much of that investment, is based upon the anticipated use of that water at some time in the near future, and if you don't look at that, then you are ignoring values, you are ignoring economic investment. But in particular those two things together that he is deleting I think when looked at together would make it a very strong pro transfer bill, and I just want to give you my opinion as to what the amendment does and you do with it what you will. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I would like to ask Senator Vickers a question, if he would yield. Senator Vickers, I know we are trying to write legislation on the floor which is always dangerous, and I think I have your copy of your amendment, probably your only copy of the amendment, but as I understand it you want to strike lines 13 and 14, which says, "any reasonable foreseeable future beneficial uses of the water in the basin of origin". That is one issue. The second issue is you want to add the wording, "the beneficial uses to be made of the proposed interbasin transfer", which means that the basin receiving the water, we would have to take into consideration beneficial uses in the receiving basin as well as the contributing basin. Is that basically a correct interpretation of your amendment?

SENATOR VICKERS: Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR DWORAK: We really basically only have two issues.