

conservation program, 90-10 over here where you have a complaint and a mandatory program where the farmer is mandated to do some work, I want to emphasize one more thing that Senator Sieck pointed out. There are a lot of farmers out there and many of them are on farms which require and need conservation work who do not have the money. I served 12 years as a director of a watershed district and I got easements for a buck and later on we paid hundreds of thousands of dollars, or tens of thousands, of dollars for those easements. Some farmers were able to do it and were glad to do it. Later on we adopted a different philosophy where we paid for easements. So I would suggest that you go back 30, 40 years, there was much work done when Senator Sieck was active with the Salt project down here. It was done where the farmer paid for most of it and certainly he didn't get paid for easements. The times have changed. The price of the land has changed. The value of the land has changed. The taxes have increased dramatically and, therefore, I think that the proposal by Senator Rod Johnson is not a fair one. It's not that he doesn't have some good ideas, but I think at this point in time it should not be adopted and I would vigorously oppose the proposal. Again, I want to emphasize 75-25 voluntary compliance, 90-10 mandatory, considerable difference. If you're forced to do something by the state, then I think if the state feels that deeply about it, they ought to pay the bulk of the cost. Thank you, Mr. President. I oppose the amendment.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Senator Schmit. There being no other lights, Senator Johnson to close on your amendment to LB 474.

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: Mr. President, this is one particular time, assuming that Senator Schmit and I are going to disagree, although we tended to agree on most all the other issues, but I strongly believe that 75-25 is not an insignificant amount of money to be contributed or to entice a farmer to participate in the program. In most cases it is going to be up to the Natural Resource District to make in their best judgment whether or not excessive soil losses have taken place and if you read the bill you will see that the NRDs will try their very best to work out agreements with those farmers to find ways to prevent soil losses without having to cause or bring about a cause of action against the farmer. I'm assuming that in certain cases there are going to be farmers who simply don't want to participate in the program, much to their own detriment as a matter of fact. It would seem to me that good land stewardship is something that would help their yield potential of their farm operation and I