

this session of the Legislature. First I want to look at the purpose of NRDs. I always thought the purpose of NRDs was primarily for soil and water conservation, land treatment, flood control, items of that kind. Sure, in some of those instances there are some secondary benefits to recreation. I hear the comment that the city areas pay the taxes for the NRDs. They pay more taxes than the rest of the area. I would hesitate to get into that part because I don't think we have an issue before the Legislature where there is taxes involved that some area does not pay for something where it does not receive any value but I think the city areas will receive value. We have all been concerned about soil conservation. I don't think there is any issue that is more important to survival than conservation of soil and water if we are going to have food down the road. So I think it is a just expenditure of their taxes to be used in this area. We speak of the power of eminent domain and I know that the power of eminent domain is necessary in some cases but I don't believe there are very many cases where a person who has become, shall we say, a victim of eminent domain is satisfied with the settlement. Very seldom does it compensate him for all the things that he has given up in it. He is not a willing seller and while we do need powers of eminent domain I think they need to be used carefully. When we speak of powers of eminent domain for a highway or for a power line or for water lines, I think you are talking about something entirely different than power of eminent domain for recreation. There are other options when we are speaking of recreation. Generally there are not very many options when you are talking about a right of way for a four lane highway or for a power line or for water line. I think the history of eminent domain as used by the Game and Parks Commission should tell us something about how people feel about the rights of eminent domain. We have heard the comments that it is impossible to go to court and defend...for the NRDs to defend their position when we say that half of the benefits, or as now with Senator Schmit's amendment, that not more than seventy-five percent of the benefits must be for recreation, and yet on the other hand they turn around and justify the payment of the building of the project to begin with on recreation. If they can justify the building of a project by the benefits of recreation, then why cannot it be defended in this sense? I don't think that is a very consistent stand. We are also saying that very few projects today could be justified without the recreational benefits. I am wondering where we have been looking. When I look around in my part of the country I see tremendous need for land treatment, for grade stabilization, for water conservation, flood control and I think if they are saying they can't