

May 1, 1979

LB 587

SENATOR CLARK: I hope this is a real simple amendment. They have the pocket gopher research up at Chadron. They have had it for several years. Last year it got lost in the University budget. They didn't even ask for the money. They called me from Chadron this morning and asked me if I'd put this money back in for this research. Dr. Caldwell is in charge of that research. He loves it very much and he would like to continue. I don't know whether you know about pocket gophers, but a group of us went out there about four years ago, and most of the fellows are not even here any more that were out there, they were looking into these pocket gophers out there...four of them in an acre is an infestation incidentally, and all they want is the \$20,000 to continue that research. I ask for the approval (sic) of the amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Nichol.

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I rise to support Senator Clark's amendment. Some of you will recall approximately four years ago when Senator Stull started this and this is an important problem out there and they are making headway, so I support the amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Cullan, do you wish to speak to the Clark amendment? Your light's on.

SENATOR CULLAN: Yes, Mr. President, simply to say that I support Senator Clark's attempts to see that this money is placed back in the budget. It was something that was kind of lost through the University as some things seem to happen, but I would suggest that we do appropriate these additional monies for the project as explained by Senator Clark.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Warner, do you wish to speak to the Clark amendment?

SENATOR WARNER: Yes, Mr. President, as I understand the amendment it deals with areas of excellence for gophers, I guess, and, but as I...the history is correct as Senator Clark, I think, has indicated originally, it was money appropriated to the Department of Agriculture who in turn contracted either with...well, both with the University and Chadron. Somewhere along the line it was shook out. The issue has not been before the Appropriations Committee as such. To my knowledge it was not included in any appropriation request this year, or I don't believe last year either,