

people out there, there are bankers, there are greedy bankers, there are bad lobbyists, there is this, there is that. Nobody deals with Initiative 300, what it does or does not do. For criminy sakes, that is what it is all about. It is going to help or hurt this state. If it is going to hurt it, should we be changing it? If it is helping, then somebody stand up and, for the first time, tell me what it has done to help. I can show you what it's done to hurt. Somebody else tell me. Put the burden on you guys for awhile. Show me what it has done to save the family farm. Show me what it's done to help agriculture. Show me what it is going to do in the future to make this state better. I can show you, and have shown you, what it will do to hurt the state in the future, what it has done already. Now, Senator Chambers made some other misstatements. He said 15 senators wrote the Attorney General to enforce land ownership, or words to that effect. You may remember that is not what I've been claiming. I've been claiming exactly the opposite, that land ownership is the smallest part of Initiative 300, that Initiative 300 goes far beyond land ownership, that it involves the ownership of cows, pigs, in other words, livestock, that it involves the right to even farm. It is so far-reaching, but the only thing anybody talks about is "land ownership." I have suggested, and strongly stated that some of the best, most efficient, wonderful cattle feeding operations in this state are operating illegally, in violation of Initiative 300. The Attorney General has been provided that information. That was the complaint to the Attorney General. So, why enforce it, Senator Chambers? The old rule Abraham Lincoln used, and it worked pretty good, he said, if you've got a really bad law, the best way to get rid of it is to strictly enforce it. So, I will try to do that, strictly enforce it. I sat with the Attorney General the other day. I watched the information pour in from the Secretary of State, who's had it all the time. What is illegal? Let me state it for you. Let's assume, just for the sake of discussion, that X corporation, a cattle feeding operation, is legal. It has not been legal for them to feed somebody else's cattle if those cattle are forbidden by Initiative 300, and in most cases of custom feeding they are. For example, John DeCamp Corporation, livestock feeding operation. I've got a feed yard. Not really, but I wish so. I have a feed yard. Gabriella Stern and her partner there with AP form a little corporation or limited partnership and they say, will you feed 100 head of cattle