

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

April 15, 1999 LB 835

SENATOR DIERKS: The language is...the language is the same. I mean we don't vary the language at all. We just added packers to the language instead of farmers and ranchers.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Well, thank you.

SENATOR DIERKS: Um-hum.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: The dilemma is for me, and I'm getting a copy, I hope I can get it in time, I should have, of what Attorney General Spire ruled several years ago, and this is coming from memory, but I have had it confirmed by conversation with others. Back in the late eighties, Initiative 300 was put in in the early eighties and then sometime in the mid to late eighties Initiative...there was an interpretation asked from the Attorney General on Initiative 300 about the ownership and feeding of livestock by packers and, as I recall, he allowed that it was okay to have ownership and feeding of packers when the animal was placed on feed. That tends to be 150 days, 5 months prior to slaughter, and, as I recall, that interpretation was that that was justifiable owning it for slaughter. It is being owned for slaughter, not of an additional two-day sense that we're talking about here, but in a five-month sense which is rather typical. Now that can vary from 100 days to 250 days, but the typical placing of an animal on feed at 750 pounds for 5 months till they weigh 1,250. According to his Attorney General's Opinion, as I recall, that that was allowed. That would be allowed under Initiative 300. Those that are doing this in this state today are doing it under that interpretation of Initiative 300. As I would interpret Senator Brashear's amendment, bringing that definition of Initiative 300 into the statute would allow what is being done now to some extent. Don't know how widespread it is, but it is being done to some limited extent. Senator Dierks' bill, because it specifically says what it says, is going to disallow that, and I...I already know that there's a reaction to this, by the way, in the country about what is "being placed on feed" based on I'd call it a strengthened definition. In the perfect of all worlds, I would like the strengthened definition. On the other hand, because there is packer feeding extensively in other states of this country, perhaps everywhere, especially the larger states, Kansas and Texas, which are one and two (Nebraska tends to be