

PRESIDENT ROBAK: The Chair recognizes Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yes, I did file an amendment and again I probably won't take this to a vote at this point. I think I will follow Senator Dierks' advice and suggest that he take a look at this language if there is a Select File and in my case, quite frankly I hope there is not a Select File on this bill, but it's pretty apparent that there will be. The word...what I am doing with this amendment in line 7, striking the word "or" and inserting the word "and/or" or I don't know it that's a word or not, and/or, the phrase "and/or". The rationale there, as I understand the word or it means that one circumstance will apply or another circumstance will apply. And the two circumstances that are being juxtaposed against one another are the animal will...is the kind, the products of which will be human consumption or they will be pelts which ordinarily use for human apparel. Senator Dierks, may I ask you about the condition of cattle?

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Dierks.

SENATOR DIERKS: Yes, sir.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Are they normally...excuse me, are they normally ordinarily constitute food for human consumption?

SENATOR DIERKS: Yes.

SPEAKER WITHEM: And do they have the kind of pelts which ordinarily are used for human apparel?

SENATOR DIERKS: Yes.

SPEAKER WITHEM: In that case the word "or" there, doesn't that mean that they would not apply because they meet both circumstances and they don't meet just one circumstance?

SENATOR DIERKS: I think it implies that they would meet both circumstances.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Wouldn't adding the word, expression "and/or" clarify that so that we would know that they could meet either both of those circumstances or meet only one of them?

SENATOR DIERKS: I think so but I'd like to think about it a