

at this time I think I am going to oppose the amendments proposed by Senator Schmit although I know there is some validity to some of them. I do oppose the efforts to try and incorporate LB 593 into this bill at this time, however, because I think it epitomizes the problem to this whole issue that we've had over the course of the past year. What I think you need to know is the history involved with this legislation and the issue and let's start back with last year. Actually we can start two years ago when a bill was introduced on behalf of the Ag Department, I believe it was two years ago, to try and adopt the Pure Food Act. It had the elements of LB 547 in it and it died at the end of the session two years ago. So last year the bill was introduced in the form of LB 547, was again developed by the Ag Department, was introduced by the Ag Committee and then was heard and held and was advanced and everybody was for it and we found the end of the session approaching. So what happened? Senator Schmit and I talked it over and with Senator Johnson who was a cosponsor of LB 487 we decided to incorporate the elements of 547 into LB 487 in order that that bill could be passed in its entirety and that last year we could deal with the question of the Pure Food Act and without waiting yet another year it looked like 547 was not going to pass. So we did pass that legislation. It has been good legislation. It has served the state well in the year it has been in effect. However, we did have a controversy last summer with the food booths at the fairs and then we also found that the bakeries in the homes that are of concern also came up as a controversy and all of a sudden Governor Thone started attacking the bill and the lousy legislation we passed last year and how terrible legislators we were for voting for that bill which I think was almost unanimously adopted last year and we found out pretty quickly what it is like to be out of session and not be able to defend yourselves under those circumstances because in the end what we were doing was carrying for the Governor and for the administration and for the Ag Department, legislation to adopt the Pure Food Act and if there were concerns about the elements to that bill those concerns should have been expressed to the Ag Department which had developed the legislation and not the Legislature which took that bill, which expedited its passage last year and I think did a good job in dealing with the issue. But then we were the scapegoats and we were the fall guy last summer when all this controversy came out where we weren't, in fact, the fall guy. We were not the people that should have been held responsible. We took the Ag Department at its word and I think their word is good that they worked on this issue, that they worked with the different interests and developed legislation that was in the best interest of the public of the State of Nebraska and I do believe the elements of that bill that are now being attempted to be amended