

measures that will be taken, presenting to you the entire package for approval or for disapproval. There is a lot more detail in the amendment. I can't represent to you that everything is perfectly coordinated right now. I didn't have time to do that, but I will do it if you're interested. But I do suggest to you that this is a reasonable compromise. It really is, in fact, a compromise. The counties can legislate but this Legislature, in the end, when it thinks the matter is important enough, can also say we're doing something special, we're doing something unique with this particular unique resource. And I think I will end at that point because I think that gives you conceptually what it's all about. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Lamb, on the Beutler amendment.

SENATOR LAMB: Thank you, Mr. President and members, Senator Beutler's amendment, as introduced at least, does not strike the bill or strike the amendment. It's an addition but, in essence, it's a new bill. This is a new bill we're talking about, an 18-page bill. It's longer than my bill. It's longer than LB 511. It completely changes it. It takes out the Natural Resources Commission, puts in the Game Commission. I don't know if that's the way it should be or not, but what I'm saying at this point that this is a new bill. This is a new bill that could have been introduced in the first ten days of the session. It has not had a public hearing. If this bill were introduced, I'm sure that many of the people that supported LB 511 at the public hearing would be opposing it. This is not the way the system is supposed to work. Senator Beutler is convoluting the system by bringing in an amendment which is not an amendment. It's a completely new and different bill and it does deal with instream flow. It gets into another bailiwick. Maybe we should do that, but if we do do what is in this amendment, we should do it in the proper sequence. We should introduce the bill, we should have a public hearing, we should go through the process. That has not been done. I...you know, briefly, I considered challenging it on the basis of germaneness. I'm not going to do that. It very well may be germane, but I'm not too sure because when you look in your rule book, Rule 7, on page 53, says no motion, proposition or subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment. Any amendments not germane is out of order. Germane amendments relate only to details of the specific subject of the bill. I say that's not true, but I'm not going to challenge it. There would be a big argument on germaneness and I'm not wanting to