

not incidental to water and soil conservation, or that water was not incidental. Recreation was the thing that took second place, was incidental to water and soil conservation. We hear complaints that we cannot define recreation, that it will cause court battles. But I believe that in all cases of NRD projects the NRDs have been using benefits, recreational benefits, to justify their projects. So if they are going to use these benefits to justify their projects, they must have some skill in defining these benefits. Again, I want to say that recreation is a secondary part of the NRDs programs. I don't believe that the original bill that was introduced that the 50 percent limitation was unreasonable. I think the 75 percent limitation was granted partly because maybe of some difficulty defining these benefits. But I think that if we remember that the main purpose of the NRDs was water and soil conservation, that recreation was a secondary benefit. We look around and we find plenty of areas for projects. I am sure there are more projects than we have money to build that will live within the guidelines of the 75 percent limit for recreation. I urge you to support 243.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Question.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Schmit, would you like to close on your motion? He was the last speaker.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, there has been a lot of conversation here about local control, a lot of conversation about trust in the NRDs, a lot of conversation about trust in here and trust in there. Let me tell you what it boils down to. It boils down to this. Do you want to go back home and tell your people that we have got \$6 million in the water development fund, give or take a hundred or a million or two, depending on what we do this session, and that of that \$6 million you can only spend \$4½ million for recreation and that is going to handicap water development projects? Baloney! I have been around here thirteen years and I have seen some straw men built, but that is about as flimsy a man as I have seen. If we have to rely, if 75 percent recreational benefits are not sufficient, then God help us for ever doing anything constructive for water development in the State of Nebraska. You talk about how one person can stop projects, let me tell you this, ladies and gentlemen, I have been on both sides of the issue. As I told you, I sat on the Watershed Board for a dozen years and we never had to