

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

April 15, 1999 LB 835

cattle is one thing and that's...that's in the prohibition, says you can't do this for the production of livestock, but it says "or for the production of livestock products. That's exactly what a packer does. What a packer turns out at the end of the packing chain is a livestock product, as defined by Initiative 300. That's one of the confusions here. All these terms, the "engaged in," the "keeping," "feeding," "owning," and "production" and "production of livestock products," these are all the terms of Initiative 300. The only thing we didn't do was use the concept of farming and ranching, which is where the court would come with the clear interpretation that we meant something different.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Brashear, do you think that packers have lawyers who are competent and well-paid?

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, I do.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you think a lawyer for a packer, in view of the legislative history we have made on this floor and the meetings members of the Ag Committee have had with those packers themselves would challenge this on the basis that you gave us saying that they think this statute prohibits them from doing that which they lawfully can do now? Do you think there is a lawyer for some packer who's going to advise his or her principal, who is the packer, to bring such a lawsuit under this bill?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Senator Chambers, I'm not much into prophecy, particularly with regard to lawyers, so I'm not going to try and guess what somebody's going to do.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, I will tell you that such a case is not going to arise and he acknowledged earlier that the packers are not going to challenge this because it would result in enforcement on them. There is going to be...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...no challenge.