

it and you are going to completely stop all water projects in the State of Nebraska with an amendment of this type and I kind of favor Senator Kremer here in saying that we need further study. I, too, am opposed to take land just strictly for recreation, and when we talk strictly for recreation, that means camping, hunting, and this type of thing but water based, I sure wouldn't want something like this to be put on there and stop these water base projects because we need these definitely in the State of Nebraska. If we put this amendment on, we will stop the Papio watershed. There is just no doubt in my mind. We will stop it and I am sure that is why Senator George is very much in favor of this amendment. It was kind of interesting to hear Senator George on the other side of the coin when he talked about the cities needed that power and they wanted to take it away from him. I could hear him argue pretty hard not to take it away but I sure don't feel that we need this amendment and I am going to be highly opposed to it.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Murphy and then Senator Schmit.

SENATOR MURPHY: Ladies and gentlemen, I would point out that the money the NRDs spend on recreation is not confined to combined projects that in any way, shape or form relate to soil conservation or water conservancy. I can take you to locations in my own district where they bought a fence for a tennis court. This is the soil conservation where they lighted a baseball diamond that was five miles from the nearest water. This was a soil conservation project where they built a recreation field separate and distinct from any kind of water control. This is a conservation project. These people are completely out of hand. They are going further and further into what is Senator Mahoney's domain and I am surprised that Gene has let it go this far unless he ultimately figures to yank the rug out from under them and take it over after they build it but I will tell you now that it is the intent of that legislation to allow those people to tax the citizens of this state for necessary soil conservation and water conservation projects, not to be building playgrounds all over the state. I think John's point is well taken. It will not preclude them using eminent domain if they can justify under the basis which they were derived from, we didn't construct them, they have been handed down from the watersheds and the water conservation department, but to allow them to use eminent domain to go build recreational areas was never the intent. They can have their eminent domain to do what needs to be done but not what they would like to do in order to grow,