

there would be projects built across the State of Nebraska where recreation was not the principal purpose of that construction. But we have amended the bill to a point now where if a project does not exceed 75 percent of the benefits for recreation, it can be built. Now, ladies and gentlemen, if there isn't enough justification for the construction of a project, that there be 25 percent of its benefits for some other purpose than recreation, then I do not believe that that is a wise use of public tax funds. I do not think in the first place that it is proper to condemn property, one man's livelihood to provide for another man's recreation. I have said that many times. It does not prevent the Natural Resource District from a willing buyer and a willing seller agreement. But if we allow the condemnation authority to continue unabated, we will eventually increase the cost dramatically of all projects and eventually there will be a very serious breakdown between the landowner and the Natural Resource Districts. Very few of the Natural Resource Districts would ever use the power of condemnation. To use it in an instance where it would exceed 75 percent of the benefits of a project I believe is unjustified. There are too many worthwhile projects that will never be constructed if we allow this to go on this present path. You can raise all kinds of issues if you like and some of those have been raised, some of them may be justifiable, but the principal bottom line is this, if you only have \$3 million to go into water development projects, should it be built for recreation purposes or should it be built and used for soil and water conservation purposes? At least 25 percent of it. In other words, out of the \$3 million we would appropriate this year, or \$4 million hopefully, \$1 million would have to be for some use other than recreation. Now I ask you, is that unreasonable? I think not. There isn't any person in this body or in the rotunda that can stand there with a straight face and tell you otherwise. And they have been there time after time after time and I am going to ask you once more again this afternoon to support this concept. We have had to take some licking and some public discussion I guess as to how we spend our money. Well, I don't think any of us can go back to our districts and say, yes, we put \$4 million or \$3 million into the water development fund but they can use the whole darn bunch of it for recreation purposes if they like. If we want to spend money on recreation, then let's properly appropriate it to the Game and Parks and have it up there where it is properly funded, properly administered, and properly managed, and not go through the sham of running it through the Natural Resource Districts. Now again I want to say in closing, this does not prevent the Natural