

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

April 15, 1999 LB 835

about as big as a grasshopper, so it's not a product that I can use for commercial purposes yet, unless you buy a bunch of them and make shish kebabs out of them or hors d'oeuvres. But because that is not feasible, because I couldn't sell them for enough, I won't do that yet, but Senator Raikes must have been checking me out. Now that that's out of the way, I want to go back to the discussion we were having. Over here in the culture corner, we've been looking at Senator Bromm's amendment and it is an attempt to tighten what is being said. I'm sorry that Senator Wehrbein...oh, I see him coming, but I...I would like him to hear this too because he is a farmer. I call him the Squire. Nobody owns these animals permanently. Everybody who produces animals will own them temporarily. They're not reared as pets. Any handling of these animals is designed to prepare them for the process of slaughter. When the packers purchase these animals, they're not purchasing them for the purpose of starting a zoo or a wildlife preserve. I know what Senator Bromm means, but every word of consequence in his amendment could be used as a basis to challenge what is being attempted here. I think the fewer loopholes that can be presented, the better. Who can define "temporary"? If we begin to use words to define what we have, then we have to begin to define the words in the definition. We may then have to go a third step and define those words that we used to define the words in the definition and pretty soon we will have a Section 4 which may be longer than the bill exists now. In order for Section 4 to be challenged, some packer, because it refers only to the packers, is going to have to make the absurd allegation either that, under this language, I cannot purchase animals. The packer's not interested in seeming like a total fool. The packer is going to have to say, this law prevents me from taking care of these animals between the time I purchase them and slaughter them. If the packer is going to make that allegation, he has to have an existing controversy. The controversy would exist if somebody challenged a packer who is maintaining those animals between purchase and slaughter. So we've got a packer who has purchased the animals. I don't believe Senator Dierks is going to go to court to get an injunction to prevent that packer from feeding those animals between purchase and slaughter. Senator Bromm is not going to do it. No producer of these animals is going to do it. I don't have standing to do it, so who is going to challenge a packer's...