

amendment as it's now drafted, as Senator Lamb said, will become the bill. As far as gutting the bill, I really can't accept that that's really what we're doing. The bill, the concept I thought was to deal with the opportunity to have protected streams, to identify those areas that have these remarkable or outstanding recreational and geological and cultural and other type values, that that was what the bill really was doing. Last week, as many of you know, I was...had the opportunity to go to Ontario, Canada and be a guest of the Parliament and the speaker of the Parliament in Toronto and learned a great deal about their parliamentary system and the way they run their government. And they have kind of a unique system that I have shared with some of you and I'll share with the entire body relative to one of the procedures. One of them is when they, what they call first reading is simply the introduction of the bill. Second reading is a debated period of...on the bill, but they are not allowed to amend the bill at the second reading. What they are only allowed to debate is the underlying principle of the bill. They don't get into the debate of what...probably who is going to be the specific overseer of such a project, what the dollar amount would be, how many individuals may be involved, all those things and those that we have are little local auctions on, the numbers and the like, they are not allowed to debate that. All they're allowed to debate on second reading is the underlying principle of what it is they're trying to accomplish by the introduction of that bill. Once it gets off the principles stage, and in their third reading then they can get into the amendments and the particulars of that particular bill. I think what we've been debating here and it's been good because we've been talking about the underlying principle and that being in this bill, the protected streams, to preserve and protect the waterways that are important to us as a state and what we're really down to and the difference between my proposal and Senator Lamb's is simply who do we put in control? Who do we allow the local counties at the county level to be the entity that crafts a plan of their choosing, however they choose, that may not be integrated, may not fit with a broader based constituency who actually has interest in that river, people down the stream, people upstream, people across stream, wherever they may be, but simply that particular county's interest, or whether we take an entity that has statewide interest, like the Natural Resources Commission, that provides that Natural Resources Commission the opportunity to come up with a coordinated plan for that designated waterway, and to identify some standard by which all counties who are