

completed. Now a few years ago during the Carter administration when energy was a tough topic, there was an individual came back here, went down to my office and gathered up a lot of the material that we had and wrote an economic feasibility study on ethanol fuels, sent it back east and sold it for 180,000 bucks. Same thing here, he took what we had thrown basically and peddled it to the federal government for \$180,000. We're doing the same thing here. We are allowing someone to get \$25,000 to copy a report that has already been written, printed and available to you. Now, I have another amendment which will strike the 25,000 from the bill, if you want to just have something to pass for nonsense purposes, but the bill ought to die. The bill shouldn't be here. The bill is here because of the "good old boy" syndrome, give good old so-and-so something so they can go back home and say well we did something for you. Mr. Tomlin is a nice guy, I haven't...nothing wrong with him, nothing against him, he is a nice guy, but he is making a career running around saying, Schmit wants to sell our water, we've got to have some other point of view and, therefore, we have to have some kind of a study. First of all, for \$25,000, if you really wanted to do research in depth, you probably couldn't do anything. But the Water Management Board studied all aspects of water transfers including whether or not it ought to be transferred in the first place and that information is there. I'm going to quote you a couple of other comments here. One of the Environmental Defense people says, points up the benefits that farmers would rather temporarily overlook, wouldn't income from water marketing help pay for new irrigation methods that might save water? Another thing he says, if the price per acre foot starts out high, he says, competition will drive it down to a fair level as other irrigation districts get in on the action. Then one more comment which I think, remember, it comes from an environmental person. If there is more of a willingness to pay for maintaining the environment, we wouldn't have to rely on bureaucratic whim. Makes a lot of sense. Many times, ladies and gentlemen, you'll find out that various groups are not as far apart on ideas as we think they are, if they'd ever just sit down and communicate with each other, and I think we've done that many times and we need to do more of it. But this is just simply an unnecessary bill, it is not needed. It ought to die. It should not have come to the floor and time after time after time on this floor we say, well good old so-and-so hasn't passed a bill in three years. Maybe they haven't had a good bill in three years, got to give them something. Well about time, ladies and gentlemen, that you introduce a bill and enact a bill