something you can pacify your constituents with. It will be something you can go back and tell them you got done. But you are not going to do one positive thing for water conservation. I happen to sort of agree with Senator DeCamp. You are not going to listen perhaps. You are going to go ahead and do it, but many a time I have sat on this floor in 13 years and heard the old argument, well, give good old so and so a bill because it is not going to hurt anybody. And as Senator Lamb said, he thought the bill would be on its way, and it ought to be on its way, Senator Lamb, to retirement, because if it isn't, it is going to come back to haunt us all some day and if not to haunt us at least to plague us a bit and perhaps embarrass us. So I am going to ask you again, consider this, where are you going to get the funding? How are you going to rationalize the denial of the vote, and what happens if you try, or we try to expand that in future legislation? I don't think you can find yourselves comfortable with the answers to those questions. If you can, then you are mighty ambivalent. Thank you very much.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I have no doubt that when we are done with water by the end of the year Schmit is going to hate me, Lamb is going to hate me, Kremer is going to hate me and so on and so forth. They may already, but they will more. Now I have hung back and I have tried to work behind the scenes with all parties on it, and I will continue to do that. But I am not going to sit by and see some bad things done if I have any ability to stop it, so let's just play a game and show you what is in the bill for a minute. The bill says, after going through I don't know how many hundreds of thousands of dollars would be involved of research for the Director of Water Resources to decide A or B, but whatever his decision is after all this time and money is spent and looking at the whole state picture, all you have to do to upset that whole thing if he rejects it, a control area, is to have a vote of the people. Here is the other side. Are you ready for this? If you want to be consistent, if you want to be honest, if you want to be fair, if this is such a great idea, why just put B's side on it too. What if he says it should be a control area and Schmit doesn't like it, or somebody doesn't like it, why not go have a vote of the people then too, and undo everything? That is the precedent you are setting. That is the principle. You say, well, no, that ain't the way it is going to work. Baloney. That is exactly what was in 375 of Schmit's bill and Kremer's bill, the other half of this coin, and I was outraged when I saw it there too, and I took it out. Now, if you are going to deal