

investment. So while the original investment may seem a bit high on the part of the subdivisions of government, it is the long-range and continuing investment which the farmer must commit to, which I believe in effect, in the long run will supersede that original investment. I'm glad that Senator Sieck mentioned the amount of money that is involved here. I think it is a ridiculous amount of money. We ought to be ashamed, embarrassed, and mortified I think to talk about this bill in any serious kind of a vein when we don't put any money into it. Now you can talk about whether we go 75 percent or 90 percent. But just ask yourself how much more work you are going to do with 75 percent of 100,000 than 90 percent. I say you better get the project in place and convince the farmers they ought to participate because they just are not going to do it otherwise. Oh, yes, they say we'll force you to do it. Well, good luck, ladies and gentlemen. You know what that is going to be like. You're not going to get very far. You could go to these farmers today and I can point out many of them and suggest that we engage in this kind of a practice and the bank is going to laugh at you. Soil conservation work does not immediately generate additional income. In fact it will usually reduce the farm income because it will take land out of production. Some of it will be out of production permanently. Some of it will be, as I said earlier, in grass waterways and terraces which do not lend themselves to farming. Many farmers are not equipped anymore to handle the livestock that might be able to graze on the aftermath of that grass and utilize the forage production from those types of operations. So I would suggest that you ought to leave it at the 90 percent. If we don't put a significant amount of money into it it isn't going to amount to a hill of beans anyway, and we all know it. But that is not the first time this Legislature has passed well-intentioned legislation and not funded it, nor will it be the last. We've all had experience in that area before. I just think that from my standpoint pass the bill, it becomes effective, you can always change those funding levels. But if you don't put any money in it, if you don't put any money in it, you just as well kill the bill, just as well kill the bill. Why pull a charade on the public? Because I'll tell you, very frankly, the public is getting tired of it. We have seen the same thing happen at the federal level. We hear a lot of baloney coming out of Washington about the importance of soil conservation. What do they do? They've cut the funding for the ACP program I think about every year since I