

March 29, 1983

LB 73

SENATOR BEUTLER: There are no further lights on, I assume Senator Eret that you will waive closing? Okay, the motion, the question is the adoption of the Eret amendment to LB 73. All those in favor vote aye, those opposed vote nay. It takes 25, please vote.

CLERK: Senator Beutler voting yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: We need a couple more votes. Please vote. Is there anybody else that wishes to vote? Mr. Clerk, record the vote.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of Senator Eret's amendment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: The amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, the second amendment.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Kahle would now move to amend the bill.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Kahle.

SENATOR KAHLE: Mr. President and members, as you heard the bill explained when that bill was drafted for this year's introduction it exempted the process that local feeders and farmers would have to comply with the law. Then the committee amendments put that back into the bill. What I am attempting to do is take it out again. It is a little complicated but I'll try to explain it. Section 85-518 requires licensing and bonding of grain buyers and transporters. Under current law commercial feeders who buy grain from their . . . for their own feeding operation must obtain the license called for in that section. The bill as it was introduced sought to remove this bonding and licensing requirement. The committee amendments seek to retain it. My amendment again seeks to remove this requirement, in other words, my amendment puts the bill back into its original shape with regards to Section 5, which removes the requirement that commercial feeders be licensed and bonded. My reasons for this are as follows: First the current law says this section does not apply to purchases by the buyers, for the buyers own use and consumption. Second the current law says commercial feeding is not private use and consumption. Therefore under current law commercial feeders are not exemp' and must comply with the licensing and bonding requirements. The bill would remove this second provision from the law. Without it use and consumption would presumably be interpreted to encompass commercial feeding so feeders would be excluded from the coverage of the section