

SENATOR SIECK: Yes. Mr. President and members of the body, I thought we were going to compromise, but it doesn't look like we are going to compromise. It looks like we are going to go just the way it is written. I do have to agree with Senator Vickers, and I think it is a lost cause. And we are not going to have transbasin diversion. We are going to let some of our areas dry up. Let's take a good look at that water. Let's use it. Sure we are going to support Prairie Bend and I would be the first one to support it. I think we should catch this water and store it, and I think we can and I know we can. But there is still going to be water getting away that we should be using, and that is what we are looking at. We don't want to take anybody's water, that is furthest from our mind. But we are tightening this thing up so much that we are not going to have transbasin diversion. And that is about all I have to say. I just feel that it is a lost cause as far as we are concerned. But I would sure like to warn you, there is a lot of good, rich land that could dry up. So I urge you to support the Vickers amendment.

SENATOR NICHOL: Senator Dworak. I don't see him in the House. Senator Schmit. Oh, excuse me, Senator Dworak is there. Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President and colleagues, I oppose strongly the second half of the Vickers amendment. And I keep hearing statements that for all practical purposes this is going to preclude any transbasin diversion and I don't read that at all in the language that Senator Vickers is trying to strike. And I think we ought to look at that very closely on page 6 and read lines 13 and 14 and it says, "any reasonable", and I think the word "reasonable" is a qualifying word, and "foreseeable" and I think that is a qualifying word and certainly not an open-ended type concept... "any reasonable foreseeable future beneficial uses of the water in the basin of origin". I think when we are talking about irrigation potential, agricultural use, when we are talking about industrial potential, when we are talking about municipal potential, you certainly have to take the foreseeable reasonable future uses of those people in the contributing basin into account. I think in any kind of a spirit of fair play, and I don't think anybody, whether it be Senator Sieck or Senator Kremer, or anyone else on this floor, has any intent of taking water away from a particular basin when the people in that basin are expected to be using that water. And so this gives some protection, and I don't think an over abundant protection, but it gives some protection that these people can look into the reasonable foreseeable future and be assured that