

state funds and federal funds to develop those water projects. Now I would think that we should not cut those funds. We had a bill introduced in the Legislature earlier to take some money, and I believe it was from the cigarette tax, Senator Kremer and Sieck and others sponsored so that we could have more water projects and yet I see some of the same Senators who spoke so strongly and who committed them so strongly to funds for that particular program, now voting to cut that particular program. I think it is not wise. I think that we should reject these amendments and move the bill back. I think we are about to make a very serious mistake and I would hope that we would place our priorities in their proper perspective and from my point of view, that would be a vote against the Schmit amendment.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I would like to explain again. Obviously if you are of the opinion that no funds ought to be appropriated for this purpose, why then you would vote no whether it was \$1,000,000 or \$300,000 or any other amount. What I was trying to suggest and I know certainly the majority if not in total of the Appropriations Committee feel strongly about the way the money was allocated in 585 for the Natural Resource Commission. However, the way it is done, there was \$750,000 for the conservation fund. There was \$500,000 for discretionary money and then there was another \$750,000 added to the natural resource fund or the resource development fund. It is my distinct impression that that discretionary fund in all probability on the part of the Natural Resource Commission will go to the resource fund and my assumption is that the \$300,000 that would be transferred here could, in fact, be made up from the discretionary fund by the commission and have no adverse effect as a practical matter on the resource development fund which, in effect, it might be taken from because of the discretionary money that would be used. I know this sounds confusing I suspect but there is well over \$4,000,000 of backlog projects in the resource development fund and I honestly do not believe by transferring this money at this time and in this amount is going to adversely affect the water development program and on that basis and the other alternative is to add, that I would hope the body would not do, just outright addition of general fund money. It seems to me that this is perhaps a reasonable basis at this time to promote some interest in gasohol