

to this. You know, I understand what you're trying to get at. I think the bill spells out very clearly that all of these agencies will be involved in this process, and there are a number of shall's in this process, it's not may's, they're shall's in the bill. And I think that all of these different entities, all of the different state agencies are all going to be involved in this process and the process will work that way. Now, if a couple of years down the road we find, as a Legislature, that they're not...they're not cooperating properly, we can always come in legislatively and force them to cooperate, we can always do that. But I don't think at this point that we need to do that because I think we're setting ourselves up for problems with the EPA again, because we're not going to have a lead agency again with this program. If they can't reach a consensus, this doesn't state who's going to be in charge. It just says that the...it says the Director of the Department of Ag is the chairman, but it does not say that that chairman has any veto power over what the committee decides. And it does not say that the chairman will make a final resolution if the committee can't reach a consensus. So I would have to raise in opposition to this. I don't think that we set up a good program when we try to set rules and regs by committee. I think that if this was set up merely as an advisory committee, where they would simply have their input into this process, and it would say there's hereby created a rules and regulations advisory committee consisting of these, that's a whole different ball game than what you're talking about here, because this is not an advisory committee you're talking about here. This is the rule and reg setting committee, and I think that's the problem. If it were an advisory committee it would be okay. This is not...this is not an advisory committee. This is the committee that sets them, and I don't think you're going to come up with a very good program if you use a committee to set rules and regulations. So I will rise in opposition to the amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Speaker Baack. Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes. Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. I rise in support at least of the concept of the Avery amendment. And I haven't spoken on this issue before, but I do think that what Senator Avery has done here is...is given these other departments and agencies more of a role. And maybe...maybe, Senator Avery, maybe it should be more of an advisory committee. I don't know. But I like the idea of...of