

emphasize that if you have a 160 acre farm and you have 30 acres of it in terraces and waterways, those acres are subtracted from the cropland base. The same acres could be under erosion, there could be a ditch 20 feet deep and 30 feet wide, but in most instances it is called cropland acres. So when a farmer follows good husbandry and does those things that he and I, all of us, know are necessary to maintain the land, he is penalized by the federal government for doing so. I think that is ironic and I think there is a lot of conversation now about the federal sodbuster bill, and so forth. I'll make a little prediction on this floor, and I think that Senator Sieck will back me up, as well as Senator Rod Johnson, within 10 years much of that land will be broken out of grass again and returned to cropland. It is going to be because of the various programs of the federal government that they do that. I also want to point out that much of this land used to be utilized for livestock production. Again, because of federal intervention, much of that land is no longer productive or profitable in that manner, therefore, that land was plowed up and seeded to row crops, and certainly has contributed to the erosion process. I think I was perhaps one of the very first farmers in the area to utilize a minimum tillage. The practice was developed by the Fletcher Manufacturing Company at Columbus in cooperation with the University of Nebraska, one of the finest things that I think the university has done in cooperation with private business. It's been more than 30 years since I bought my first minimum tillage planter, I've never used anything other than that. And I think it is an excellent practice. It's not an easy practice to participate in I can tell you very frankly. It is a lot easier to plant on bare soil. But I want to emphasize again that soil conservation is a very expensive process, and at the present time, first, we do not have much money that has been appropriated to that process and, secondly, the farmers who need to use it are probably not very likely to be able to come up with their share of the money. Number three, I want to point out that in the event a complaint is filed against an individual farmer, and he does not have the resources with which to meet the cost sharing, I do not believe that there should be any harassment of that individual. I've resisted land use legislation for 17, 18 years, and I still think that because a man has a deed to the land, pays the taxes on it, he ought to be allowed somewhat control over that property. I want to point out also that this bill could become a harassment, and I do not