

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

April 15, 1999 LB 835

Secondly, and this was done pretty much in response to Senator Brashear's comments and so forth about tightening up the language, I'm suggesting that we clarify that a packer cannot engage in the temporary ownership, keeping, or feeding of livestock, not to exceed five days, unless that is necessary and incidental to the process of slaughter. It's not uncommon, in my understanding, and Senator Wehrbein or Dierks or someone, or Senator Jones may want to verify this, but you'll sometimes have a sale of livestock and a delivery on Friday, for one reason or other, no slaughter occurs until Monday or Tuesday, and so you do have a temporary period during which it is necessary for the packer to own, keep and feed the livestock, and certainly don't want to have an absurd argument that that's illegal under this bill. So I hope I'm just taking away that absurdity that someone might argue exists. Secondly, a packer might not be a corporation in violation of Initiative 300. And, as I mentioned in one of my previous times speaking on this bill, there are packers and there is a rather large packer that is a family...family-owned operation. And if it is possible for a packer to be a family operation and own, keep and feed livestock under Initiative 300, this would say that that's illegal. So, this clearly goes beyond Initiative 300 with this language. And it's a...it's somewhat of a loophole, it's somewhat of a...of an area of law that I think we need to clarify. And if the body chooses not to adopt this amendment, I guess I at least want to hear the rationale or the intent for what "packer" is intended to mean. If that does allow a family or some arrangement to do this, then I think we need to know that. So that's the amendment. I think that explains it. I don't need the rest of my time. Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Bromm. For discussion on the Bromm amendment, Senator Dierks.

SENATOR DIERKS: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I've taken a pretty good look at this amendment, Senator Bromm. I guess I really don't have much of a problem with it. I think it does...it might even strengthen the bill, as far as that goes, it makes it a little more specific. So I would urge your support of the amendment at this point. Thank you.