

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

April 15, 1999 LB 835

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That is the question.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: If I was a packer who believed that this bill, in its entirety, was not in the best interests of the consumers, my shareholders and others, and I believed it was onerous or offensive, I would attack it on the basis of vagueness.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But here's what you have to show, that you are being...you think you're going to be prosecuted for doing something which you legally can do now. Can a packer right now legally own, feed, and keep these animals for months on end, even though ultimately that packer's going to slaughter them? Can that legally be done by a packer under Initiative 300?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: All right, so we're not...we...the packer knows that. Can a packer legally purchase livestock and maintain those animals from the time of purchase to the time of slaughter? Can that legally be done now under Initiative 300?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, because of the way the definitions are laid out in 300.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, how does the language in Section 4 prohibit a packer from maintaining those animals between the time of purchase and the time of slaughter?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: By the plain meaning of the English language that's used.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is the packer...do you believe that the term "production" had an understood and accepted meaning in the agriculture industry in the same way that "terms" in the Uniform Commercial Code have a meaning in the commercial arena?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: I believe it has a clear meaning in the cattle feeding industry and it also has a clear meaning in the packing industry, and you're not going to the next phrase, or live...production of livestock products. The production of