

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

April 15, 1999 LB 835

legislate, carry out the will of the Legislature, and in no case would it construe those words in such a way as to arrive at an absurd result. It would be absurd for the Legislature to be considered to have passed a law that says you cannot do what is necessary to keep animals alive between purchase and slaughter. We don't need to write in all these other things and say if the cattle are purchased April 15th and they'll be slaughtered April 17th that on April 16th, if a cow weighs so much, then that cow can be fed so much food and given so much water and allowed so and so. You don't do that. There is an industry which has practices which are well-known, well-defined, well-understood. A court would tell a lawyer, you don't have to explain to me that you must keep cattle alive between the time you purchase them and slaughter them. That's presumed in this operation. It would be absurd to presume that even the Nebraska Legislature, as much as Chambers criticizes them, would say by statute we're not going to prohibit a producer from selling cattle to a packer. We're not going to prohibit a packer from purchasing the animals. But we're going to prohibit the packer from providing nutrition for those animals to keep them alive until they're slaughtered. It's Senator Dierks' bill, Senator Bromm is from a farm area, so maybe we should defer to what you all would decide. But, Senator Dierks, for my part, I would not change this language. Who is going to challenge this language? What packer is going to say,...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...I believe I'm prohibited from feeding these animals? Who is going to raise the issue? Now if, on the other hand, a packer is keeping, feeding and owning them in a way contrary to amend...to Initiative 300 and admits that in court, he or she has lost because that would put the person in violation of the constitution. In other words, and I'm going to turn my light on one more time because in discussing it the way I have I could have created more confusion than clarification, I don't believe we ought to amend the language. That's just my opinion.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Chambers. (Visitors introduced.) For further discussion on AM1299 to LB 835, Senator Dierks, followed by Raikes, Brashear, Wehrbein, and