

and what the amendment itself does? I certainly don't. Can you tell me again exactly what you're referring to.

SENATOR LAMB: Well, I can...Senator Schmit, I can tell you the exact lines that I'm referring to. No, I don't know what the whole amendment does. You know when you get a ten-page amendment on five minutes before the bill is brought before the Legislature on Select File, there's nobody in this body, I believe, that knows what's in the amendment. But my amendment is on page 9, and it's to reinstate the language on lines 16 through 19. It...it...it...it directs the director of water resources to consider the effects of out of stream uses of water when he's talking about granting an instream use.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Thank you, Senator Lamb. I appreciate your explanation again. I would support the Lamb amendment. I do so with mixed feelings, knowing that if it is supported, and Senator Lamb, you will probably feel more inclined to support the amendment. And I have not yet had the chance to pursue the amendment in depth, and I have some serious questions about the entire amendment, not just because of what I see on the surface, but what I consider to be a trend. And I guess my concerns are these, that it is not just that we are adhering to the philosophy, which none of us really argue with, that the public water suppliers are entitled to water, but my question, which will be asked later on, is to what extent does this give the public water supplier control over the aquifer above the water supply. And to what extent will there be intervention and regulation of that utilization of that aquifer. And so I will support your amendment, but I hope that my doing so does not make the amendment more agreeable to you, to the point that we actually find ourselves in more difficulty with an amendment which we do not want. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Schmit. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, the public water suppliers really don't have any strong objection to this amendment either. I'm not personally going to vote for it. I don't think it's necessary. I think that the director of water resources gets whatever evidence he wants, or she would want in the future, and this particular provision is at best burdensome, at worst meaningless. In any event, it's interesting that Senator Lamb would require of a public water supplier what he would not require of an irrigator, that is an