

substantial irrigation benefits of that project which brought a lot of economic advantage to that part of the state that it hadn't had before. It involved interestingly enough the creation of a lot of wildlife habitat. I remember Senator Wagner pointing out to us that wildlife is now more plentiful around St. Paul and around the Farwell Project than it had ever had been prior to the creation of that particular project. Now Senator Schmit has had an amendment adopted to this particular bill which excludes from the condemnation prohibition large projects but does include smaller projects. Now as far as I am concerned the smaller the project the better, because if we have a lot of small projects put out around the state, why the aquifer recharge benefits are going to be spread out around the state. There is going to be more wildlife benefit as we have smaller projects around. There is going to be more access to recreational facilities by a wider number of people than if we have just a few large projects spotted various places around the state. So I would take exception to Senator Schmit's amendment to the judgment that it is implicit in that amendment that somehow smaller projects are worse than larger projects. I think the opposite is true. Now with respect to this business of seventy-five percent recreation and this whole question of how the benefits are computed, prior speakers have argued that this is ambiguous, that it may be unconstitutional because how can you take a section of the Nebraska code and have it depend on computation of benefits. Most of us, frankly, and I am included, don't really understand how the benefits are computed. I know that recreational benefits are a factor, flood control benefits are a factor, irrigation benefits are a factor. In some instances groundwater recharge can be a benefit and in some instances the sediment control can be a benefit but those matters are really for the experts in determining how those things are to be done. And I think one of the problems with this particular bill is we genuinely do not understand how...

SENATOR CLARK: You have one minute left, Senator Hoagland.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Thank you, Mr. President. ...how a meat axe approach is going to apply in saying that anything seventy-five percent or over as far as recreational use is concerned is not permitted. Now I have some other things that I want to say, so I will put my light back on to address this issue again but let me just say in closing that it is important particularly, I think, to the eastern one-third of the state that recreational benefits not be excluded because recreational benefits automatically are going to jump when you are talking about a project near Omaha or