

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

March 16, 2004 LB 916

how this would happen. It looks like to me it falls on the back of the operator to notify NDEQ if there's a change, because they're not going to know. Let's say you take out a permit for 1,000 head, like you're supposed to, and you do everything year after year, which most of us do. You might not think about something changing, so you're not even going to report it to NDEQ, so they're not going to know that you're changing, that you went to maybe even a higher phosphorous ration or a lower phosphorous ration, which technically could throw you out of compliance. So I'm concerned. I'm going to listen to this as to whether I support or not. It seems realistic enough, but I'm concerned about the technicalities in a lot of this now today, because technically...looks like to me if you have one animal and you have water running through your place, you're going to be included in this regardless of what the law says at 1,000 or whatever. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. Those senators wishing to speak to the Preister amendment are Senators Chambers, Beutler, Jones, Burling, Vrtiska, and Schrock. Senator Chambers, on AM3168.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, my rural colleagues are overly suspicious in some instances. I don't know whether it's because they are aware of a lot of inappropriate things being done and regulations or control methods put into the statute would uncover them, or if it just comes from the notion that agriculture is under an assault and they have to protect it from any negative approach, even if it takes the form of criticism. Each one of us has to fill out an accountability document each year. If certain things have changed, we have to make note of those items. If nothing has changed, then a short form is available and, in effect, you declare that nothing has changed. Now, I'm still smarting under that McDowell appointment and our confirmation, which we subsequently withdrew. If you have scoundrels, they should be put in a position where annually they have to make a declaration one way or the other. They should not be left in a situation where they can say, well, I didn't that I was required to say anything about this because, in my opinion, in my judgment, on and on and on, I was not under the law, not under any rule or