

gentlemen, you tell me what he's done for 600,000 last year. And if you can...if I can take that back to Bruno and sell it to a lot of his customers in his tavern, then I'll come back and I'll get off your backs. I don't think I can do it, nor can Scotty sell it, nor anyone else. I ask for your support of the amendment.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Mr. Speaker, members, I oppose Senator Schmit's amendment. The special master is getting \$300 an hour, Senator Schmit, and the clerk gets \$175 an hour. We've asked a lot of times about this money, and I think you used the analogy of a fire department. And I think in a way it's almost the same way here, you don't anticipate a fire, but you still fund the fire department. Here we're hoping that we can get this settled, but we still need to fund it. The point is an offer was made back in April to the Governor of Wyoming, and there was absolutely no response at this point. In fact Nebraska has, I think, understand, made more than one offer of settlement, and nothing has come of it. So where is the good intent of Wyoming, if they truly don't want to do this. It almost would appear that they want us to lay down and be run over because they figure we may give up first. I have several quotes from the special master, most of them in our favor. And I cannot understand, at this point, why we're ready to give up. He stated, the United States and Nebraska have also put into this record convincing evidence of potential injury to establish equities, if that priority were to be impaired or changed. You notice that Wyoming has taken the position it does not have to abide by this settlement agreement involving Grey Rocks Reservoir, which is located on the Laramie. The special master ruled that Nebraska should have the opportunity to present its case in tandem with it's case regarding inland lakes priority to show that Deer Creek's potential interference with tributary flow could prejudice inland lakes storage rights, and harm equities in Nebraska, and for Nebraska appropriators. And, lastly, the special master stated in his opinion, since the record offers no guidance, since the jurisdictional issues are sufficiently open and complex to require flushing out, and since this court has an obligation, sui sponte, to apply federal law, including environmental legislation that's been enacted since the decree was enacted in 1945, the downstream of Tri-State issue is left open for further explanation. It seems to me this makes a good case to continue what we're doing, and if you talk