

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

April 15, 1999 LB 835

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, that is my purpose.

SENATOR BROMM: Is it your...secondly, is it your purpose, however, to continue with Senator Dierks' efforts to prohibit the packer, and I'm using the word "packer" broadly, the packer from engaging in the long-term ownership and feeding of livestock in competition with producers who...who are not in the packing business?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Senator Bromm, but I do want to elaborate to one extent. I am deferring to the expertise and the knowledge of my colleagues involved in agriculture that that is...I...I could not stand and articulate exactly how and why that needs to be done in any technical detail, but I do respect and honor the opinion of my agricultural colleagues that that needs to be done, and so yes.

SENATOR BROMM: Okay. Here's my...here's my suggestion. In the section...I think you're amending Section 4 of AM0814.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, sir.

SENATOR BROMM: If we were to say it is unlawful for a packer to be engaged directly or indirectly, and I think that's important, directly or indirectly, and I'll get to that later, in the ownership, keeping or feeding of livestock for the production of livestock or livestock products other than ownership, keeping or feeding necessary and incidental to the process of slaughter. And with the proper legislative history on this floor, it would seem to me that that would narrow the ability of the packer to be engaged in the business to those activities that you are saying and articulating that are a problem. Is that...does...does that make any sense?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Senator Bromm, of course it makes sense. That would not solve the problem. I think if we want to use then phrase "directly or indirectly" we ought to add it to AM1299, and it isn't because of pride of authorship. We ought to be saying directly or indirectly engaged in farming or ranching.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.