

told the Nebraska Natural Resources Commission, a rural constituency, the controversy could be settled in short order if all interested parties got together and talked; could be settled in short order and six months later it's not settled. And the word I get is that the negotiations aren't going anywhere because you have one party that is not interested in negotiating. Another disinterested party, I assume, would be the Natural Resources Commission attorney, Jim Cook. In this same article he says, Cook says he does not sense any Nebraska group "desires to clobber irrigators" in settling the controversy. Well, there are lots of different sides to the story, but I think if you start thinking about it carefully and look at this resolution as a bit of evidence of what is going on, six lobbyists hired to lobby for several months for something that is almost total nonsense in terms of arguing that it complies with the federal definition of comprehensive plan? That, to me, is evidence of the very kind of intransigence that is costing the irrigators out west so much money. This very thing that they're doing today is symptomatic of the problem.

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: I would call the question.

SPEAKER BAACK: Do I see five hands? I do. We will now proceed to vote on ceasing debate. All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no.

SENATOR WITHEM: Go ahead and record.

SPEAKER BAACK: Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 9 ayes, 10 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BAACK: Debate does not cease. We will go to the next speaker, Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, I'm glad I came on the floor in a good mood this afternoon because I hope I don't use a lot of bad words and upset some folks. I'm glad that Senator Beutler, a long-time friend of mine, brought up