

problems that would need to be addressed in the language of the compact?

SENATOR SCHMIT: No, I do not think so, Senator Schimek, and again, I'm not an attorney but our council has discussed it many times, we've discussed it, I've discussed it with Mr. Packett who is the Attorney General's representative to the council and, very frankly, there are a number of questions but as was indicated in the letter from the Attorney General and was indicated by Senator Warner, the action of this Legislature relative to appropriation of funds really, in effect, does say we are members or we are not.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Okay, aside from the constitutional questions then, I'd like to ask about the future of the compact and it's my understanding if I've read this information correctly that there is a one-time \$50,000 appropriation?

SENATOR SCHMIT: That is correct.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: And then after that what keeps the operations of the compact going?

SENATOR SCHMIT: There is an initial appropriation of \$50,000 and a membership fee. The compact then determines what it requires to operate on a biennial basis and the compact determined that the three major grain producing states would participate on an equal level and equally in the expenses and the expenses would be allocated among those three states on an equal basis...

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ...but that the states of New Mexico and Wyoming would participate on a percentage of the total production which they produce among the five states. So that annual fee for Wyoming and New Mexico would be much less than the annual fee for the three major states.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Okay, thank you for clarifying that because I heard you mention it earlier and wasn't sure what the fee was, but then one last final question, Senator Schmit. This reminds me of the ongoing operations of the United Nations and all the discussions there has been over that over all the years. What happens if one of these states refuses to pay ultimately the