

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Senator Sieck. Senator Schmit, the last light before closing.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. First of all I want to emphasize some of the points that were made by both Senator Rod Johnson and Senator Sieck, there isn't any money there. We're talking about \$100,000 at the lower end and maybe \$1.9 million at the upper end and if you wanted to take bets here, and I'm the betting man I guess, I would say it would be a lot closer to the 100,000 than it would be the 1.9 million. So Senator Johnson has a valid point. He wants to stretch that money as far as it's going to go. You start stretching \$100,000 across the State of Nebraska, you're going to have to stretch it pretty thin, even as a rubber check I think, to make it stretch. It isn't going to stretch. We're going to do nothing with this unless the state puts some money into it. We're just...I have put the bill together and the bill is a good bill. It goes much, much farther than I would ever have gone five years ago, I'll tell you that very bluntly, because it takes away from the farmer a lot more of the right to manage his land than I would ever have acquiesced to a few years ago. But if we do that, then I believe it's fair that the state pay 90 percent of the conservation cost. There is a vast difference between the 75 and the 25 under a voluntary program and a 75-25 under a mandatory program. I think you can get the difference. If I voluntarily come into a Natural Resource District office and say I want to do this conservation work on my farm and I will participate with you and I will pay 25 percent of the cost, that's one thing. But if my neighbor says, Schmit is causing trouble for me and, therefore, I want him to spend five or \$10,000 on conservation work on the farm, that's a big difference. I'm going to ask you one more thing. What are you going to do if the man hasn't got the money? Are you going to put him in jail? I don't think so. If you are going to cause more difficulty for the Natural Resources, why do you want to do it? Put the money up there to the 90 percent, try it. If there is any money that comes into the program in any significant amount, we'll see how the program works, maybe we can roll it back down some time. But at this point in time I am totally opposed and I would rather not have the bill, I'd rather the bill die with the 75-25 percent funding in there. And, in fact, I have no interest in the bill to the point that I would offer my own kill motion on it if that were to occur. That's not a threat. I just feel that deeply about it. I want to emphasize again, 75-25 of voluntary program, voluntary