

March 6, 1979

LB 359

conservation act is doing something to prevent this from happening. We are also losing about six million acre feet of water down the Mississippi River and going into New Orleans which we are not getting any benefit, which all falls within the State of Nebraska. I feel that we are going to capture some of this with this act. Now this act was just implemented last year. It didn't even get off the ground. I understand that we allocated \$259,000 to this fund this fall. Out of this, we built over 31,000 feet of terraces which does hold land back. We built two acres of waterways. We built ten flood retarding structures and we built fourteen reuse pits. These are all structures in the small watershed program that holds our water back on the land. I feel this conservation act was something very well endorsed by my colleague who was formerly here and I would highly support opposing this bill and I ask all of you to vote no on this bill.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Stoney.

SENATOR STONEY: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I think that Senator Sieck just expressed in his comments some of the concerns that I have in repealing a law which was enacted just during the last session, in 1978. I don't think that we have really afforded the bill an opportunity to work. I know that the funds that were allocated, as Senator Sieck has mentioned, have been put to good use in my estimation and I just am concerned that this body would consider in less than one year repealing and eliminating everything that was accomplished last year in attempting to conserve soil surfaces here in the State of Nebraska, so I do have that concern. I was wondering if Senator Schmit could respond to a question that I have regarding the testimony that was given by Mr. Jim Cook. Not being a member of the Agriculture Committee, Senator Schmit, I would be appreciative of knowing what the thrust of his comments were in opposition to repealing this act?

SENATOR SCHMIT: Senator Stoney, I wasn't there either when the bill was heard. I was out of the state at that time. I did review Mr. Cook's comments. Mr. Cook, of course, opposed the bill. As an attorney for the Natural Resources Commission, I think that it is very evident as to why. It is another avenue, another opportunity for the commission to have access to funds. As I indicated earlier, we have never ever really supported the development fund. There has never been a sufficient amount of money in the development fund to do anything really substantial and then we come along and we add another fund and so it becomes a question of who can get their dipper in the bucket, I