

motion. If it fails, at least this year right now, I'm going to oppose the advancement of the bill. And, as I said, the bill by itself as of today I don't think is that harmful, but certainly the crack's in the door or the camel under the tent, all those things are certainly applied (inaudible) language in this bill. I'm not afraid of the future. I'm just afraid what this bill may be leading to and even the bill in its original form, some of the things it introduced, some of the requirements it introduced on groundwater irrigators is something that I think would certainly be harmful to those groundwater irrigators in years to come. You know, Senator Wesely states about 98 percent of the water out there is used by agriculture, 2 percent is used by municipalities, but obviously in times of dry times that 2 percent eventually gets a precedent. That's a decision we need to make. I just...it's not...it's not what the bill says that I'm opposed. It is what the bill does not say is what I'm opposed to and concerned about. For that reason I will rise to support the bracket motion. If it fails, I will oppose the advancement of the bill.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Lamb, followed by Senators Coordsen, Schmit, Dierks, Beutler, Lindsay and Nelson. Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Thank you, Madam President and members. Senator Beutler and others say that no more study is needed, no more study is needed. Admittedly, there has been study, but let me put this before you. Here on Select File we have a ten-page amendment which begins with the words: strike all sections and start over again. Does that indicate that the issue's been thoroughly studied? Why would we have to have a ten-page amendment on Select File which had not been printed in the Journal if this issue had been sufficiently thought out? We would come in with a bill that had agreement, had had agreement, that would not have tremendous amendments. There have been a number of amendments which indicate to me, no, the issue has not been sufficiently thought out to be proper. For instance, only public water suppliers can get the instream flow rights for their wells. Farmers cannot get the same instream flow rights for their wells. This means, regardless of the public water supplier's priority date, it will in fact be ahead of the farmers' because the farmers cannot get one to recharge their wells. Now that's the sort of question that we have, I think, and while it has been studied and I realize the extent of Senator Beutler's frustration and the frustration of other