

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

April 15, 1999 LB 835

like to change some of their practices, improve their participation in the food chain that is so critical to agriculture, I don't think we want to engage in treating people as if they're the enemy, more than is necessary to accomplish the common good. Senator Dierks was correct on General File in pointing out to me on the floor something I hadn't focused on in a long time, if I ever knew it, that Initiative 300 does in fact prohibit packers, because it prohibits corporations, from participating in farming and ranching. But he said to me that packers are prohibited from owning and feeding livestock and, I'm sorry, respectfully, I don't read Initiative 300 that way. Initiative 300 says packers are prohibited from participating in farming and ranching and farming and ranching is defined so as to include the feeding and the keeping of livestock. But when we now propose to adopt LB 835 with language which says that it shall be unlawful for a packer to be engaged in the ownership of livestock, follow me on this, it's not unlawful for the packer to be engaged in farming and ranching. That's what Initiative 300 says. LB 835 says it shall be unlawful for a packer to be engaged in the ownership of livestock for the production of...for slaughter and live...production of livestock products. I must tell you, and I'm not trying to be silly, I'm not certain how a packer buys a cow, feeds it over the weekend and slaughters it if he doesn't own it. And I believe that language is fatally flawed. I will, in further discussion on this floor, point out that this statute...this not only has criminal penalties, it has...or it not only has civil penalties, it has criminal penalties, because you are dealing with criminal statutes also. If this bill is vague, since it does not have a severability clause so that the civil side can be save, then those who have invested so much in LB 835, to try to accomplish a good which the Legislature wants to be supportive of, will either be embarrassed or thwarted or both. So I really believe the bill needs some careful consideration and what AM1299 does is to reference Initiative 300 and, instead of saying that it shall be unlawful for a packer to be engaged in the ownership, and I want to...I want to read that language specifically, we would delete the language that says it shall be "unlawful for a packer to be engaged in the ownership, keeping, or feeding of livestock for the production of livestock or livestock products." In order to avoid that clause being problematic, AM1299 would take us back to the Initiative 300