

you've got two farmers side by side, one of them irrigating with a center pivot and the other irrigating with flood irrigation. Under center pivot fifteen inches per year might be enough to get you by pretty good. Under flood irrigation in the same year it probably wouldn't be anywhere near enough. So the one farmer is going to look at his neighbor across the road and he says, "You know if I am going to continue to irrigate the same number of acres I've been irrigating I'm going to have to get me a center pivot." So what we're doing is putting in the statute a reason to promote certain people's products. Now I'm not sure that that is our place or our prerogative to do that. Let me point out another thing to you. It's the job of the natural resources districts and it should be their concern the total number of inches of water or the total amount of water withdrawn from a given area. That is the whole idea behind the control areas or the management areas is that they should be concerned about the total amount of water withdrawn. Now as Senator Schmit pointed out in his opening remarks under the irrigated acre concept as opposed to the total acre concept or some other concept it might be possible for an individual, let's say you had a thousand acres of irrigated ground and they allocated ten inches of water per year. You might decide you wanted to raise rice in some corner and put a hundred inches of water on ten acres. And the NRD has the authority to control runoff remember. They have the authority to control pollution. As long as you are not contributing to pollution, as long as you are not contributing to runoff, whose business is it to tell an individual farmer he can't do that? Is it our business to tell individual farmers that they can't put more water and raise perhaps a higher use crop such as alfalfa or something? I don't think so. But even more than that, I don't think it is our business to tell those local natural resources districts exactly what tool they can use when they allocate that water. If the local people in that area want it on an irrigated acre basis, that's fine. They should be able to do that. If they want it on an irrigatable acre basis, that's fine and they should be able to do it. If they want it on total acres, that's fine and they should be able to do it. I don't know why we profess to give them the authority to control their future in the use of this resource and then we say but you can't do it only in the way we tell you you can do it. We're making the determination here today how those local elected boards are going to be able to allocate that resource to those people that they are the most responsible to. Now I further suggest to you that there is a clever reason