

and closely and after proper and thorough input and debate and understanding if they are all right we will certainly support them next year. I reject and urge you to reject, personally I reject the Warner amendment to bring this bill back.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President and members, I guess I would echo Senator Dworak's remarks, the proposals that Senator Warner has in the sheet which he has on our desk may have merit. But at this late date it is more like a proposal that should be presented to a committee at a committee hearing than to be presenting after the bill has been passed on Final Reading. I think Senator Beutler has made a real effort to construct a bill here that is beneficial, that will do what it was supposed to do, that will provide some protection to the basin of origin but will not eliminate the possibility of transbasin diversion. So I believe that the bill should go on its way, should be signed by the Governor and next session if Senator Warner has his proposals perhaps defined a little bit better that would be the time to come back, consider them at that time. I would oppose the Warner amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, of course I would like to object very strongly to the suggestion being made to you today. We have talked a little bit about suggesting such major amendments at such a late date, but let's be clear in our minds on just how late this date is. The bill has been passed by the Legislature and the motion to reconsider.....of reconsideration is to reconsider a bill that has been passed by the Legislature. In the short three years that I have been in the Legislature I have not seen this happen except for a bill that had technical flaws to it. I think each and everyone of us in here is owed the courtesy by everybody else of having their objection brought up front and early on General File or on Select File or if you can't get around to some of the bills then on Final Reading. But to come in after a bill has been passed by a 39 to 8 vote or whatever it was and to suggest a series of amendments, most of which were considered either by the committee or on the floor, or by the introducers and rejected, seems to me to be a use of process which is uncharacteristic of the person who is suggesting it in this instance. I don't even know whether to try and address the suggestions in the amendment because I really can't believe that this body is going to allow this