

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

April 15, 1999 LB 835

would have to be present before there was a prohibition?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes. Yes, it would. If you were going to tie them with "and," then you've made a necklace. You have not disjoined anything. "Or" is a disjunctive. It is not saying fee...keeping and feeding, keeping or. You even pointed that out. When you put that disjunctive in there, it means feeding, it means ownership alone, keeping alone, or feeding alone. Each stands by itself. When you put the word "and," you have joined all three together and all must be present before the prohibition kicks in. Now, a packer cannot feed livestock, even if he is going to say I'm not keeping it. If it's possible to feed without keeping and keeping could be for a certain period of time, a packer could not do that if the feeding is for production of the livestock or the livestock products. The packer cannot keep these beasts if they're being kept for this prohibited purpose. The absurd result would come in if you were construe this language to mean that between purchase and the slaughtering the packer could not keep them alive. What Senator Bromm is trying to do with his amendment, and maybe it will have to be adopted to set the body's mind at ease, is to narrow that period of time between when the packer makes the purchase and slaughters the animals so that nobody could say the purchase can be made however many months ago...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...and ultimately they'll be slaughtered. I don't believe that is the way this language would be construed as it exists now, but if...let me ask Senator Brashear this question since he's back there. Senator Brashear, do you think a packer would try to use the language that exists in Section 4 right now to make a purchase four months before the animals are to be slaughtered, whole own, keep and feed those animals himself or herself? Do you think the packer would try to use this language for that purpose?

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: No, Senator Chambers, I don't. If I were a