

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

January 12, 2004 LB 172

fail...did I? Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Mr. President, members, I wasn't going to get into this, but this is much too serious an issue to allow any kind of misperceptions out there, and I...not that I'm an expert, but if you follow the line that I many times do, perception becomes reality. One of the reasons we have the trouble in the BSE issue and one of the reactions that you see, and I'll use the example of slaughtering the 450 Holstein calves that they didn't know which one it was, I don't think there's a scientific basis for doing that. The problem is the perception in the public mind, almost worldwide, is the fact that there can be something done, and the problem has become we're doing some things in the industry that don't need to be done and a good example is this testing of all 37 million head of cattle that are killed in this country. There is no need to do that at this point because, as Senator Louden said, I think it's as high as 80 percent, or we have about 19 percent cow/bull kills, so let's say 80 percent of our cattle are under 30 months. There's no reason to test those because we haven't seen it, except we did see one in Japan, I think, recently. The point is a lot of this is being done because the public perception is...becomes a fact, and they believe that there is a risk, just as Senator Chambers reiterated. Now, nothing in this world is absolutely zero, so I hedge my conversation in saying that you can't say nothing is absolute in terms of the infection that Senator Chambers is talking about. But the point is, we're doing many of these things because public perception says that we should do this, and in that process, and we'll take the cow, for example, from Canada, in that process we intimate, if you will, that we have to test it to be safe, when the reality is we probably don't. And so once we start not testing these...or killing these cattle, these Holstein bull calves, I think primarily, to do that, we imply that we should be testing when, in actuality, there probably isn't anything there to test. We know they're under 30 months, but...so we perpetuate myth, if you will. Once again, we perpetuate the perception and then, even though it's nonscientific, we do it anyway. And so when we say we want to base our decisions on science, when we go ahead and do some things based on the misperception in the public, you get mixed up, and that's our dilemma, and that's the reason I jumped into