

Constitution. And not only does the amendment say, "the right of the people peaceably to assemble", it adds, "and to petition the government or any department thereof". There could be a cost, obviously other than financial, in restricting the right of the people to assemble peaceably. But how could we reach the point where a financial cost can be involved? Let us say that a rule or a regulation would talk about the types of groups which would be allowed even to assemble on public lands. There could be a crafting of a rule or a regulation which would seem so egregiously wrong in its reach and scope that groups desiring to peaceably assemble, as they interpret their motives, would assemble there anyway. And if that arose it would necessitate the bringing in of the State Patrol, perhaps the National Guard, and that would entail a financial cost. So all of these constitutional protections need to be considered and they should be considered the same way that Senator Jones and Senator Bromm and others are trying to get us to respect, as they call it, this property. What they have missed and what is being discussed at the national level as the air goes out of this balloon is the fact that big polluters are the ones behind this bill. They have tricked the rank and file farmer, as they always have done. The rank and file farmer is the cannon fodder who can easily, because of the stressfulness found in the agricultural community at this time because of low prices and other things, can easily be made to believe that their problems are created by federal bureaucrats who are going to deprive them of the value of their property. So maybe some of these farmers now, after being encouraged by legislation of the kind Senator Jones is presenting to us, which other people at the federal level are presenting, they may be encouraged to believe that their rights are being attacked, that they are being misused by a government of bucket-helmet-wearing, jack-booted stormtroopers who will hurt and kill ordinary citizens, which is what was contained in a letter put out by the National Rifle Association. And the NRA has said, their leader has said, on national television, he will not withdraw from that position. So when you have that kind of rhetoric coupled with this kind of legislation fallaciously making people think that the government is somehow taking their property without just compensation is totally unwise and, in the present context of social events, irresponsible. Senator Jones could not give us a single example to justify this legislation. Before we change radically the way business is done we should have a compelling reason to make that change. Such a reason has not been given to us. Persuasive argument has not been given to us. The only reason this bill