

there are some other commitments with regard to lunch. If you would like to send a staff person, that would be fine as well. I just wanted to let you know that we are passing those around right now. They are also being distributed in your mail boxes in the mail room; come yourself, send a staff person. I am hoping it will take approximately half hour to forty-five minutes at the most. Thank you very much.

**PRESIDENT MOUL:** Thank you, Senator Hall. Would you like to now address the Schmit amendment?

**SENATOR HALL:** Thank you, Madam President and members. I rise in support of Senator Schmit's amendment. I have not spoken to the issue but I have voted for the striking of the money, as Senator Schmit has tried to in the past. And it is not an issue of, I guess, do we need to protect water in Nebraska? Clearly we do, whether it affects a district on this side of the state or on the western end of the state, and I think that is of critical importance and we need to protect that. I guess the argument is is that do we need to front the money as we do in the appropriations bill right now? Senator Schmit's amendment just basically strikes that amount in half. I think that is a good faith effort to say, look, let's look at what we are doing here and let's try to move toward some kind of reconciliation of this issue. The comments that Senator Johnson makes I think are well taken in that what Wyoming has said is that if you spend 4 million, we will spend eight. So in other words, if we spend 2 million, we will only spend four. Does that mean that the process does not continue? Yes, it will continue. No matter what amount of money you appropriate, it will continue, and it will continue to be argued I think for a number of years until you do see folks at the executive level get together and say we need to come to some kind of solution, if at all possible, in this area. By cutting the amount of money we are going to set aside, basically, we are going to cut their retainer. We are going to cut the amount of money that we allow them to draw on in half. Now does that mean that we are going to hamper our representation? I think not. I think what you are saying there is that we are going to decide that this is a prudent amount of money to allocate. Should we need more money, the process allows for those individuals to come back to this body and make their case. It clearly does not, I think, in any way jeopardize our standing in this lawsuit. Anytime you set the figure, it is going to hit the wall in terms of using that money up, and that is all Wyoming said they were going to do. Whatever you expend,