

condemn a square foot of property, and we built projects up and down the Platte Valley. We never had to take one foot of land by condemnation. Let me tell you one more thing. When a public subdivision comes out to that individual, the recourse is on the side of the public. The individual is a mighty small person when that time comes because the Natural Resource District has the full resources of the taxpayer behind it. They have legal counsel, they have unlimited tax dollars and they can pursue it and pursue it and pursue it and if you happen to win the first time around, they can go right back into court and drag your tail through there again and again and again. You talk about using money for lawyer fees, I say it is a shame that we are using as much money for legal fees as we are now. But I suggest and it has been suggested by other people here this afternoon that it is not inconsiderate to provide some guidelines to tell a Natural Resources District at least 25 percent of those benefits need to be from something other than recreation, and if that isn't sufficient to justify the construction of a project, then I can tell you one thing, after 35 years of driving and flying and walking over this state, I can find you plenty of projects that will have at least 25 percent of other benefits and you won't have to walk more than a stone's throw from this Capitol to start finding the first of them. We have a responsibility to use those tax dollars in the best possible method. Fun and games is fine and a certain amount of it is all right, but you better take care of your principal responsibility first, and I think if you went over and told the Governor that we were going to let the sky be the limit and we could spend all of this water development money on recreation, I think he would be constrained to veto a heck of a lot more than if we say it is for development purposes and soil and water conservation. Now Senator Fowler has pointed out a pond of water is an intriguing thing. It is something which appeals to all of us, but there are better methods of soil and water conservation than just building ponds, desirable as they are, and I support the concept. There is nothing very glamorous about a minimum tillage field of corn, I can tell you it is a messy looking thing, but it will conserve a lot of water and it will conserve a lot of soil. And the Natural Resource Districts that are engaged in that kind of an operation and encouraging the farmers to engage in that are doing a real service. The same thing with the tree planting situation, and there are many other conservation devices, the terraces and diversions. Nothing very glamorous about them. They don't look very good when you take a picture of it and put it in the paper, but it is a very real method of soil and water conservation. There isn't