

is a half a million dollars. Now if we don't come up with that, why don't we withdraw from the lawsuit then and Wyoming wins. Now you might, you might negotiate an agreement after that or before that or something else like that but I don't know that. I don't think any of us know that. A tremendous amount is at risk right here with this amendment. If you back it to \$100,000, probably you are going to force the department and the state to withdraw from this lawsuit and Wyoming will win, period. Now that's not the kind of...we're already, unfortunately, probably already in the war and I agree with Senator Schmit, I would like to negotiate a peaceful settlement and a very inexpensive settlement. But I don't think right here and now just to pull the plug on this amount of money is the way to do it. And I agree with everybody in here that says we do not want to spend this money and if we can work on some intent language to force them to the negotiating table before we appropriate it, let's try and do that. But Senator Schmit's method of just deleting this appropriation and saying come in with a deficit, talk about a blank check! And then you tell them, is there a limit to that deficit? Is it \$5 million? Is it \$10 million? We don't know that. If you appropriate the money up front, they do know what their limit is. But if you follow Senator Schmit's amendment, you give up. Wyoming wins and you say, that water's not worth fighting about at all and, yeah, we wish we could have negotiated a cheaper solution. If you adopt the amendment, you totally lose, Wyoming wins and the amount of money we've already expended is for naught because we gave up. I urge the disapproval of Senator Schmit's amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, members, I strongly oppose, and I emphasize strongly oppose, Senator Schmit's amendment. And I think we ought to stop and think about it. Maybe there is some progress being made, in fact, I understand that there is. But to take Senator...or Governor Nelson's horse away so he can't ride out there is about tantamount to what you're doing here. If we take this money away, we're going to lose any leverage that we may have and it doesn't make sense to me that we've gone this far, we've gone so far as having a special master. We're on the verge of submitting summaries to the Supreme Court. Why would we take away all the legs that we've had and literally cut the legs out from under any negotiations that we have going on? We may well be making some progress but to take this money away at this time simply throws in the towel,