

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

April 15, 1999 LB 835

Chambers.

SENATOR DIERKS: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. I didn't say before and I...I've neglected to say that I'm not supporting the amendment that Senator Brashear has. I think that the amendment that he has provides for more vagueness to the issue and I wonder then how much more difficult it is to do judicial determination, so I'm...I can't support that. I guess what I'm getting at is that we've defined farming and ranching, which includes ownership, keeping or feeding of livestock for production of livestock or livestock products. I think that a vote for this amendment would imply at the very least that the Legislature has the belief that farming and ranching doesn't include livestock feeding and, at most, legislative approval of packer feeding, which is not what the people passed in 1982. So I just can't support the amendment and I will...I've seen Senator Bromm's amendment. It has...I think it holds a little promise, but I will give the rest of my time to Senator Chambers, if he's interested in it.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Dierks. Mr. President and members of the Legislature, now that I've touched on all those issues, I'm going to try to speak in as straight a line as I can. We are dealing with a specific industry. Those in the industry understand the meaning of these words. The term "production" does have a meaning which is understood. When I said that the court is not going to construe language in such a way as to arrive at an absurd result, the absurd result would be to say that the purpose of this language as it exists now is to say that once a packer has purchased these animals, first of all, the packer does not own them. This would make the purchase contract illegal on its face, because once the packer purchases them the packer owns them. We know that is not the intent of the language. It is not to prohibit the packer from taking possession and ownership of those beasts to use as he or she fit...she sees fit, within the law and the constitution. To feed the animals, going by the language of this statute, prohibiting them for keeping...from keeping them for the purpose of feeding them, cannot be construed to mean that once the packer has taken possession, paid the price and now owns these