

already blossomed. There are not many persons who are here today that were here when the Natural Resource Districts were created. I do not recall that there was ever anything mentioned...any mention made of spending money on trails. I know there was some reference to recreation, but it was principally in support of the idea that if someone built a pond, and someone wanted to put some fish in it, and throw a boat on it, that was fine. My principal concern, I believe, is that the Natural Resource Districts were created to enhance and conserve the natural resources of the state. You can hardly call an abandoned railroad right-of-way a natural resource, although I would have to say that based upon some of the treatment we've given the railroads, it might well fit that category. I would suggest that I don't really disagree with what Senator Beutler is trying to do. But I do believe that there are other ways to accomplish what he's trying to accomplish. I think that at this time, with limited resources, limited ability to resolve the legitimate needs of the state, that it is a poor practice to try to allocate any funds in this area. Game and Parks have a substantial budget. They generate substantial amounts of funds. I believe at the present time they are involved in the purchase of land from a willing buyer, willing seller, which will allow them to provide for trails. In fact, if they want to buy some land from me, I've got a farm not too many miles from Lincoln, has some native grass on it, has some timber, has a pond, has some springs, it's a beautiful area. I suppose they'd want to buy it for less than I want for it. But the facts are that if you want to recreate, there are many, many ways to do it. There are many people that use the property now, and they're welcome to it, and I enjoy them out there. I just wonder, Senator Coordsen, if that individual you were talking about has a pair of wooden shoes with the name Vanempting (phonetic) on them, they come up missing off of one of my places. And I strongly suspect that they repose in somebody's recreation room. But the facts are that I don't think that's probably a problem with the trails, but it does mean that situations such as that can develop. I think the principal concern here is this, do we at a time of limited revenue and tremendous responsibilities and tremendous problems revenue-wise want to embark upon a proposal which will, in effect, take some additional money? We're going to argue about \$100,000 many times on this floor. Crime Victims Reparation Fund needs 100,000. We're going to spend \$25 million, I believe, for a new prison. But we can't find 100,000 for the Crime Victims Reparations Fund. We can spend millions and millions of dollars to defend certain individuals