

is made up. You know, there are 15 members on the commission 12 of whom come from the Natural Resource Districts themselves. The commission is heavily rural oriented. Membership on the commission is not based on a one-man one-vote basis. The rural and agricultural interests clearly dominate the commission, control its proceedings, control its comments and its recommendations, control its staff. Now that very commission now having spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of state funds has come back with this among other reports and the four-page summary of its recommendations has now just been distributed to you. I see some of you are reading it, and if you will look on the top of page 2, well you can see exactly the language that I have been quoting. Now the commission has come back with a very explicit recommendation, and it seems to me now is the time to fish or cut bait. You know, we have been postponing a lot of the very difficult decisions on water legislation until these studies were done. This particular study has been done, and I have a copy of it right here. Now take a look at this thing. This is the contract report itself right here which consists of about 75 pages and in addition to that there are three appendixes, Appendix A, an atlas of maps; Appendix B, management techniques; and Appendix C, action alternatives. Now this is very extensive literature indeed showing that an exhaustive study was made by the commission and the associated agencies in relation to this problem. And they have come back with a very explicit recommendation. Now Senator Kahle argues that, how are we going to come up...how are we going to figure out what this saturated thickness is? How are we going to figure out what the size of the aquifer is? How are we going to figure out what 1 percent and 5 percent are? Now with all due respect to Senator Kahle, I think there are much better arguments in opposition to this amendment than that one. We do have the scientific techniques now to make these kind of measurements, and, Senator Kahle, there are some good arguments against this amendment but I don't think that is one of the best. We do have the scientific capability to make these judgments. They can be made down at the local Natural Resource District level. The commission is comfortable with that scientific capability. I am surely comfortable with that scientific capability. Senator Kremer talks about the Big Blue problem where we may have an aquifer that only has 40 or 60 years. We have a lot of irrigation investment, what are we going to do about that? All right now, practically that is not a problem with this amendment. An absolute maximum amount of time it takes to recover your investment