

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

May 5, 2003

LB 754

we're doing here...well, we need to back up and go back through the bill as it's amended. On page 1, line 20, it says, "A county that meets the criteria may apply to the director," being the Director of Agriculture, "county that meets the criteria may apply to the director to be designated a livestock friendly county. A county may remove itself from the process at any time." This is not something that we're forcing on the counties, it's something that the counties are going to have to initiate on their own and pursue. And if they decide it's not what they want to do, it's...they may remove themselves from the process at any time. I see no problems with that. And it seems ironic that the people that are trying to do this bill in are not connected with livestock production. In particular, for the most part, the rural senators support this bill. We're out there in the trenches, and we understand what's happening. It's not the small operators that are causing us concern. Rather, it's the large operators that don't have any real effect on this. They can go ahead and hire...they have their legal staff, and so on. It's the small operators that are leaving these counties, or not coming in at all. So I think we have to be careful that we...what we're doing is forcing some of the smaller people out of the issue...out of the livestock production area. And as anyone who's been around livestock knows, livestock production is very labor-intensive, versus grain production. If you have 2,000 head of dairy cows out there, you have 20 employees, while one farmer can grow the crops necessary to feed those cows. So it's not a question of expanding crop production. It's a question of channeling this production through livestock. We need the people. I believe my county, my home county, Hitchcock County, I think, led the state in population decline in the last 20 years. We're to the point of closing another school out there. So I think that we need to look at this amendment for what it is. It's simply striking an area of the bill that is optional anyway. And I think that it's something we want to leave in the bill. And I have...think we also have to be very careful that we don't target the small operators, drive them out. The larger ones have legal staffs, legal counsel as part of their business. And these people can work around problems and get their permits, whereas the small operator cannot do that. So I am in opposition to Senator Chambers' amendment, and will continue to support the bill as it