

have kind of a unique situation. I know that many times corporations are always looked on as the big bad guy in these kind of things and in western Nebraska recently we had a problem there where the Great Western Sugar Company was going under and there were no corporations, no individuals or anyone who could come up with the funds to buy out the Great Western Sugar Company. So what had to happen then was that a foreign corporation, a very big corporation came in. They bought up the existing GW facilities and are now able to provide for a lot of family farms and a lot of corporate farms, they're able to provide for them now a continued existence in the sugar beet market so I don't think that necessarily, you know, big corporations are necessarily bad. I think another consideration in this needs to be, what was the mind set of the voters when they voted Initiative 300 in? Did they really know exactly what they were voting in? I think that, you know, I think that many of these voters had a vision of what the family farm was. I think they thought of the family farm, especially many of the people who do not live on a farm, looked at the family farm idea and said, and they looked at it and they said, this is like the two story white house sitting on the little 80 acres. This is the farm that grandpa used to own or this is the farm that my uncle used to own and this is what they thought they were voting to save. I don't think they were taking into consideration the changes that have taken place in farming and what it takes these days to make a viable economic unit on the farm. So I'm not sure they knew exactly what they were voting for, and I think if you would ask most of the people that voted for Initiative 300, you would find that they were not voting for 300 to stifle economic development in this state. That's not what one of their objectives was and I think that this points out to us that maybe we do need to do some work on Initiative 300 the way it exists today. I know that this is a very emotional and a very controversial issue, and having watched the Legislature from the outside for many years, I know that if ever an issue is emotional or controversial the Legislature tends to try to avoid it, and if an issue becomes both emotional and controversial, then the Legislature will usually give it a lot of rhetoric, but very seldom do they take any action because it is so controversial. I think that, in conclusion I'd like to say that I think that in this case the Legislature must take the bull by the horns and we must tackle this situation because I'm afraid that if we don't and we let this thing operate for a couple more