

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

May 5, 2003

LB 754

material on...I'm going to the E & R amendments now...all of the material on that designation of a county as being livestock friendly. That, as the discussion develops, was merely the horse to carry that zoning jockey into the Agriculture Committee, knowing that with the makeup of that committee, something like this would come out on the floor. I don't think the zoning aspects were dealt with properly by the Ag Committee. I sat through the hearing. There was a tremendous amount of concern and distress on the part of people from the counties, officials and otherwise. I think, since the bill has gotten out here, there's no need for this troublesome, problematic first part of the bill. These findings are not the types of things that will benefit this state in any way. Designating a county as being livestock friendly by the state is not something that I believe constitutes good public policy. If there are counties that are more willing to accept these large livestock operations than other counties, it will be known which counties they are. I do not think the state ought to intrude at this level, in this manner. It causes me to view with a jaundiced eye the provisions related to zoning. The state is trying to tip the scale in favor of the large livestock operations and operators. That is something I am opposed to. Too many times, those who have a lot of money, a lot of political clout, or political connections, can get things done that ordinary citizens cannot. Many times, in a highly charged political environment, such as the kind we have dealing with these large livestock operations, the rights of ordinary citizens will be trampled into the ground, in the same way that the earth is trampled when you have a large herd of livestock running from one place to another. The state is not going to make a friendlier environment for anything to take place by putting this material about livestock friendly counties into the statute. If my amendment is not adopted, I'm going to work on these findings, and one of the things that I think would be imperative if this language is retained. There should be an official disclaimer by the state. Without that disclaimer, the mere designation of some counties as being livestock friendly implicitly suggests that all the others, not having that designation, are the opposite. The disclaimer would be language to the effect that a designation of this kind in no way disparages or suggests that any other county not seeking or acquiring this designation is hostile to