

March 19, 1980

LB 1002

SENATOR DWORAK: Senator, in all respect, I think you were given half an answer because as I understand the conservation fund money is divided equally amongst all the districts. Then if that money isn't used within a certain period of time, the money is returned which is what happened and that is as far as you went. But then with that unreturned money some districts had greater needs than others and so then that was redistributed to those districts with the greater need so that in fact that money was used completely, maybe not equally across the state, but used in those district...but equally everybody had a shot at it, and if they didn't have the need, then those districts with the need got more after the others had a first shot at it. It is also my understanding that in those districts with greater needs even with the additional reappropriation many of those needs are still not met. So I think that that was just a little bit confusing and I was a little bit concerned on it and I didn't want anybody to think for a minute that this money does not have use and that this money is not allocated for good conservation practices, and as Senator Murphy indicated, these are the conservation practices on the farm themselves, the small retainments and that type of thing, and so I would very strongly object to Senator Sleck's amendment because I think these are valuable uses. I think it does retain the water. I think many of these small projects help recharge underground aquifers, and to indicate that this particular fund or this particular need does not have merit I think is not so. And I don't even want to get into the position of adjudicating which one of these particular funds have the greater need or the greater worth because they are both vitally important but I think what we said as what we have seen in the past when we have given discretionary money there was an indication to put this money into the larger projects rather than the small conservation practices on the farm and I think the Appropriations Committee had some concern about that. They were willing to appropriate the money but they also did not want to make the decision as to whether the large project or whether the small project on the individual farms had more or less priority than the other and we felt this money should be spent and allocated between these two particular funds.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Lewis. We are on the Sleck amendment.

SENATOR LEWIS: Mr. President, it is most interesting after the discussions of the other day, Senator Kremer and I talked about that since, that there was a desire, an overwhelming

8676