

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 30, 1999 LB 822

whole new meaning to this legislative bill, which has only dealt with animal waste. I would tell that chemicals concern all of us who are involved in production agriculture. And, of course, one of the chemicals that's been talked about a lot is atrazine, which is diminishing in use all the time. And for any new agricultural chemicals to be...to be approved by the...the federal government they have to be more environmentally friendly than anything we've used in the past. So I think your concerns about chemicals, although are well-founded, I'm not sure at this point in time the agriculture community is willing to add that to this bill, because I think we're handling that. And I think the natural resource districts and Department of Environmental Quality are all handling that. And I think any new chemicals released for use by the agriculture community will have to go through a very strict scrutiny by the federal government before they can be released to us. And so it's not like we're out there using DDT anymore, that just isn't the case. I just wonder why we're trying to add another layer of consultation in this amendment? I think best management practices are covered. And the chemical thing, although I don't think it's a problem, this is an animal waste management bill, and I'm unwilling at this time to expand it to chemicals, even though I don't believe there is a problem. So, I understand what you're trying to do here and I commend you for that, but at this point in time I'm not able to support your amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Schrock. Senator Schellpeper, on the Beutler amendment.

SENATOR SCHELLPEPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members. This is another amendment that, on its face, sounds like it's something that is just a little innocuous amendment that's really not going to do a whole lot. Senator Schrock is right, we're going into a whole new area with chemicals. The chemical part and the swine or the livestock manure doesn't belong in the same bill. Chemicals is a whole other issue. That wasn't part of the bill up until...with this amendment. Now, all at once, we want to...we're going to be talking about chemicals. That doesn't belong onto this bill. This bill was introduced because there's one large swine operator, up around Long Pine, to try to stop that operator. And that's a good cause, I think it should be stopped. But by doing this bill and with these amendments