

SENATOR SCHROCK: Okay. If you knew the answer, why did you ask me?

SENATOR DIERKS: Well, I just want some other people to get involved here because the vote on that last amendment, which I thought was a substantive amendment, was a kick in the teeth, a kick in the teeth, not to me, but to the people that I represent. And I find a bunch of what I consider good rural colleagues in here are adding to that kick, and I want some of you to come up and tell me why what I'm saying is wrong. And you go back to things like the study was valid. The study wasn't done. There wasn't a study. You go back to the...you tell me that using information that's ten years old is still valid, that may be so, but that doesn't provide a study. You go back and tell me that the Governor didn't say what I said he said, and yet it's right here in black and white. Said he didn't want a bill. The Governor didn't want a bill with this ground water conference. He wanted information on what's going on with surface and ground water, and you responded with a bill that takes all the privileges away from the ground water people and gives it to the Department of Water Resources. And in response, Senator Beutler, to your suggestion that everybody did have input, I want to respond that they didn't. Sure, they had input at the beginning of this things. I know where the hearings were, I've got all that written down here, too. I know that you went all over the state and had hearings and then you came back here and specifically told the Water Council that you were going to not consider the testimony at those hearings; it was not going to be considered because you said it was fixed. One group had all the people there. Well, that's not true.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS PRESIDING

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: One minute.

SENATOR DIERKS: I have ten minutes.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Yes, sir, and we are at nine-o-five.

SENATOR DIERKS: Okay. Colorado law says that a hundred years for hydrological connection to exist under law for surface water regulation. If that's their law, what's the matter with 200 years, what's the matter with 500 years, what's the matter with 1,000 years? I just don't see the need for this type of