

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

February 1, 2006 LB 975

value-adding to our farm products. It value-adds to the corn in an enormous number. As Senator Stuhr pointed out, over 60 percent of the corn grown in Nebraska is fed locally to livestock. Not only that; a lot of the livestock produced in Nebraska is fed here, added...value-added to, and sent on down as a finished product in other places. So I think this is something that needs to be brought forward and we continually work on it. Thank you, Lieutenant Governor.

PRESIDENT SHEEHY: Thank you, Senator Louden. Senator Preister.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Honorable President, friends all. I will start by saying that I support Senator Chambers' amendment, I support the committee amendment, and I support the underlying bill. Having said that, when I pressed my light we didn't have the amendment and Senator Louden hadn't spoken, so let me start with correcting something that Senator Louden said. I served on the Natural Resources Committee and so did Senator Schrock, and we had Game and Parks come in and testify and they brought maps, Senator Louden, of all the cold water streams in the state. So to say that we didn't know there were cold water streams in other parts of the state is really a disservice to Game and Parks and to the committee. We knew all the cold water streams in the state. We had background information and it wasn't just Congressman Osborne bringing a bill trying to limit where the CAFOs were in these cold water stream watersheds. We had the scientific information. We knew where they were and the decision to pass the legislation was a comprehensive piece of legislation that dealt with other things as well. But we had information. We knew where those cold water streams were. So I want to make sure that the record is correct and to make this statement now, which I hadn't gotten up intending to say. Moving away from that, Senator Chambers is trying to bring a scientific approach based on science into the assessment. I support that. There have been discussions about whether something is scientific or not scientific in a lot of these CAFO discussions, and sometimes people are accused of not using sound science. However, sound science is usually whatever the person talking about it wants it to be. When it's somebody else and their issue, it's emotional. When it's mine, then it's sound science. So I'm all for basing the decisions on science and the