

little more reluctant than most people to get into the business of placing into...interjecting into private enterprise additional regulations and controls on the operation of personal property and real estate. I know that there are some arguments, and some good ones, that half of what has been said here on behalf of 124. But I do not believe that the NRDs want to assume, as Senator Wehrbein has pointed out, an adversarial role. They have been in the position of helping people, helping people to use resources in a better manner. I just want to say once again that the passage of 148 this year is going to mean that we will see more and more urban members on the natural resource districts' boards. We're going to see intensified interest in urban problems less interest, perhaps, in rural problems may be a little more interested in trying to interject into land use management government controls than you and I would like. I'd suggest also we're going to see some change in direction in the natural resource district roles insofar as erosion problems around the cities and the villages and the first and second class cities are concerned because there are some problems there. I think it would be interesting to see what would happen in the river view area near Fremont if we had a one-man, one-vote board on the Lower Platte North. I think we know what will happen. There is going to be some renewed interest in trying to solve erosion problems that impact upon private homes, and justifiably so I think. I think we have to recognize, last of all, that the fact that what has happened in the Sandhills has happened, it has happened and would have happened regardless I think because of economics and as I pointed out during the previous debate on the bill, our own Board of Lands and Funds converted many, many acres of grassland into tillable land. Why? Because it would have better return for the school children of the State of Nebraska. They did it not with an eye or an intent of desecrating the soil, but with the idea that they would increase their return. That is what drove the farmer in most instances. I want to point out again that the people who profited most from this were the individuals who sold the land, who sold the land, and while one neighbor today may decry the fact that his neighbor sold a section of land or a quarter section of land to a farmer, the farmers and ranchers who did that did so, again, for economic reasons and is probably retired on that money. So you cannot reverse the laws of economics. I would suggest that if you bracket this bill we can discuss the issue next summer.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.