

not move ahead on 375 or anything else and it was the attempt to write into law that we did put into the bill at one time the concept of owned acres, owned acres being the basis for who got to irrigate, who got to have water, so on and so forth and I'll be very honest with you. I did not understand all of the full implications of what this amendment did then but I certainly have tried to learn them since because this amendment was brought to me by a man named James Wolf from up in, around Albion, Nebraska, and as I say, this probably is the single reason this legislation, the major thing failed last year because when the bill reached the floor and it was discovered just what this would really do, the committee brought the bill back and things bogged down. Now what it gets down to and it's very fundamental rules or sense as I interpret it, Senator Schmit and Senator Kremer are both very bright and knowledgeable in this area and they can say, well, DeCamp, you're wrong if what I am saying is wrong but what it amounts to is he who owns and owns the most controls the irrigation practice or gets to control the water. For example, if you're like the gentleman I mentioned and you happen to own thirty-five thousand acres of land, then if you are allowed to irrigate let's say, one acre for every nine or every ten you own, you might have complete junk land but for all practical purposes you have rights to irrigate three thousand five hundred acres. Now let's take Joe Farmer, Joe Farmer being the guy that owns some of the best land but the rule is you've got to own ten acres for every one you are allowed to irrigate and Joe Farmer may have two or three quarters of the best land but he for all practical purposes with the best land who should be irrigating, just the average family farmer, is basically written out of the right to irrigate. So I would strenuously oppose this amendment. If ever there was a thing that I think would turn it over to the super bigs deciding who lived, died, survived in the area of farming, this amendment is it and I repeat, this is the thing that inadvertently got to the floor and ultimately last year stopped the whole water legislation. If I'm wrong in my interpretation of the owned acres concept, I apologize. It can be explained further. If I'm wrong Senator Schmit or Kremer can correct it. They certainly know it better than anybody else but what it gets down to is, he who owns, controls and the more you own, and it can be junk land or anything else, you have irrigation rights. I think it is maybe the single most horrible concept you could adopt and I think if you do this you kill the bill because I know responsible people are not going to go with this. I quite frankly think prudential would be the first one to jump on and say, "This is the greatest deal we've