

don't know if it's going to accomplish what you wanted to accomplish. On the other hand, I'll bet you money that when we get to some other later amendments, we're going to have some hell of fights over \$50,000, so you might keep that in the back of your mind as well, but I'll do whatever the body wants to do on this one but I'm just concerned about the duplication we have with other agencies and other promotion groups that are also supposedly doing the same thing that the compact is designed to do as well. That is the end of my comments.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Warner, please, followed by Senator Dierks.

SENATOR WARNER: I'll wait for the closing on my amendment.

PRESIDENT: Fine. Senator Dierks, please. Senator Warner, would you like to close on your amendment, please, amendment to the amendment.

SENATOR WARNER: That didn't take long. Mr. President, I believe the amendment in itself is no problem and as has been explained a number of times, I do want to indicate again, maybe, because this membership thing, while it does not affect the amendment, is difficult to get a handle on but as I understand the compact it does require five members, which there are five members, and there is an obligation on the part of a member state to make the initial \$50,000 appropriation to it. But the failure to do that, or until they do it, apparently does not give cause to expel them from the compact so there are, yes, five members. Four have paid. One has not paid but the compact does exist because there are five members and I assume at some point, and Senator Schmit could help, if the compact would decide at some point to expel a state for failure to having not fulfilled their obligation, then I guess we would be back to four members. In essence we have one of the five states that is a member but has not met its obligation under the compact to, as yet at least, appropriate the 50,000. Obviously there could be some other state that would join and then that issue would be moot in any event. But again, the amendment only is...has no relevance to that initial 50,000. It merely limits the appropriation not to exceed the assessment that the state would have as a result of the action by the compact.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. The question is the adoption of the Warner amendment to the Schmit amendment. All those in favor