

February 27, 1976

bill also. When the legislation was enacted in regarding to Natural Resource Districts, it limited the compensation the Director could receive or the size of the contract in which he could participate. There were individuals who felt that the size of this contract, which was \$5,000, which is commensurate with the other contracts which county officials and other individuals, city officials can engage in with the subdivision of government which they represent. Also, included, the size of the contracts that the Natural Resource District Director could participate in in cost sharing contracts on his farm. I will give you an example. For example, if one of the Papio dams were being built on a farm owned by a Natural Resource District Director, he could not...he would either have to resign his directorship or else he would be in violation of the law. The dam could not be constructed. Now, obviously, that was not the intent of the law because we have always felt and history will show that most of the Natural Resource District Directors are leaders in conservation, and in many cases, have served as guidelines for the projects which have developed over the years. There was some discussion that perhaps favoritism could occur in the construction of these projects on Natural Resource District Directors' farms. That was resolved by the fact that the District Directors are, of course, numerous, that all these contracts are well publicized, that the projects themselves are a matter of record and bidding, and there was no doubt in the minds of the members of the Committee that it was in the public interest that these amendments be adopted and the legislation be clarified. I move the adoption of the Committee amendments.

PRESIDENT: That is the question, record your vote. Record.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 0 nays.

PRESIDENT: The Committee amendments are adopted.

CLERK: I move to lay LB 715 over until Monday. Signed Senator Cavanaugh.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: I would like to ask the Chairman, was the hearing conducted on the amendments or on the bill?

SENATOR SCHMIT: Senator Cavanaugh, the amendments were offered, as they often are offered, at the Public Hearing on the bill. Now these amendments are extensive, as I pointed out, but the amendment is very simple. Even anyone can understand that amendment. If you will glance at it, if my explanation was not adequate, I am sorry but the amendment was well discussed at the hearing, and the Committee very respectfully suggested that the amendment be adopted so as to preclude any discussion or any possible disagreement as to the intent of the Legislature in this area.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: This amendment was offered at the