

issue that we inevitably, I think most of us that have worked on the bill, knew as the most controversial part must deal with it now right at this particular moment. And this I say...well, basically, the way I see it is that this issue from the beginning has been walking a tight rope and it seemed evident that if one side or the other got too much in this bill, then the other side was going to fall off and the whole deal was going to fall apart and Senator DeCamp would get exactly what he wanted, which was outright repeal. We may be walking that course right now if we adopt this language. This is, I assume, the same language that Senator Chambers offered in the committee. It is the same issue that came up time and time again in the task force meetings and it is the same issue that came up yesterday at the Governor's Mansion. We spent two and a half hours arguing this issue over and over and over again and the lenders made it very, very clear to me and to the Governor and to other people that were at the meeting, Senator McFarland and Senator Hoagland, that if this language is put in the bill, that all bets are off, all deals are off, everything is gone. The issue, I assume, will be dead, a moot point, and we will deal with the consequences however they go because I assume then if the bill passes, you are going to see some farmers not only that have financial problems today, but we are going to add to them by probably seeing that the insurance industries are going to just simply back out of the state and simply not issue any new credit in the areas of the ag sector. So, rather than taking all afternoon to talk about that, that is very clear, we are not in a position, as I see it, to negotiate, and not to a point that seems reasonable anyway to negotiate. What Senator Chambers has outlined and what the Center for Rural Affairs has outlined for you on the two-sale method is the worst case scenario that they can think of where a lender will fix the sale so that it will make it impossible for the farmer to redeem his homestead. It's the worst case scenario. I assume, and I said this yesterday, that if we pass the bill as it is written today and allow the two-sale method to work and, in fact, a situation like that occurs, there is no doubt we will be in here frothing at the mouth to change this law for fair and reasonable to get at those insurance industry officials, to get at the farm credit people, to get at the banks who have perpetrated this unspeakable act on a farmer who has waited this long to redeem his or her homestead. I have tried to say let's allow the two-sale method to work at least a little bit before we jump too far to one side or too far to the other. Now, everyone has a different interpretation of what fair and reasonable is. Some say that we do have case law that proves that fair and