

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE
February 11, 1981

The Agriculture Committee met at 12:30 p.m. on February 11, 1981 in Room #431. Chairman Carl Smith presided with all members present except Representative Briggs. Legislative Researcher Bob Person was also present.

HOUSE BILL NO. 450 and
HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION #17

REPRESENTATIVE ELLERD addressed himself to the committee as the sponsor of House Bill No. 450 and House Joint Resolution #17 and said he would like to introduce H.B.#450 first. He indicated that H.B.#450 is a repealer and repeals everything in Title 50, Chapter 35 MCA, (EXHIBIT 1). Copies of the exhibit were handed out to committee members. Rep. Ellerd also handed out a report to the Legislature entitled "Imported Meats" by the Montana Department of Health and Environmental Sciences, Food and Consumer Safety Bureau (EXHIBIT 2). He indicated that some of the members had seen this report before. It was a very controversial report at the time it was introduced and he felt at that time the Imported Meat Act couldn't be enforced. He further indicated that he still feels that way and that it is costing the taxpayers money. In conjunction with the repealing of the Imported Meat Act (50-35-103, MCA), Rep. Ellerd asked that the committee support H.J.R.#17 which is in support of Senator Baucus' bill, S.1038, in the U.S. Congress. Rep. Ellerd then asked the committee to refer to page 2, Section VII. Conclusions of EXHIBIT 2, which states "The present law has not been enforceable, since the processors can circumvent state law under the USDA law." Briefly, Rep. Ellerd explained, this means that when the store or supplier buys meat, it is his responsibility to label that meat properly. However, if the beef is ground or cut up, then there is no way that the supplier can identify if the meat is local, imported or mixed. The law, see Section 50-35-103 Labeling requirement for foreign meat (EXHIBIT 1) states that if the supplier doesn't know the origin, he is supposed to indicate that on the package. However, this is a costly, time consuming endeavor and the supplier would then have to pass this cost on to the consumer.

REP. ELLERD then introduced Dr. Jim Glosser, State Veterinarian with the Montana Department of Livestock.

DR. GLOSSER indicated that he was neither a proponent or an opponent of H.B.#450 but the Department does support H.B.#450. He agreed with Rep. Ellerd that when this was introduced last session, they felt they didn't want to become involved because it wasn't enforceable and it would be extremely difficult to administer.

It was later transferred to the Department of Health & Environmental Sciences (DHES). He asked the committee to refer to section 50-35-102 of EXHIBIT 1. By way of explanation as to the compliance by the local grocer or market, a person would have to be aware that at that level there is no way of knowing whether the meat product is imported or not. The USDA requirements very plainly state that if foreign meat is processed, it doesn't have to be labelled as to the country of origin. When the meat comes into the country and is delivered to the packing plant, they can either grind or cut the meat to constitute processing and then not inform their customers. This complies with USDA requirements and the packing plants are under the jurisdiction of the USDA and the Department of Livestock. They are exempt from Department of Health Licensing Laws (EXHIBIT 3) and therefore the Foreign Meat Act is not enforceable at the state level; it needs to be on a national level to prevent the packing plants and slaughter houses from circumventing the law. These are just a few examples of why this law has been impossible to enforce and difficult to administer. When the USDA allows co-mingling of meat at the Federal Inspection Plant level or when it is brought into the country, they allow it to be processed in some fashion, then there can be no control at the supplier level. In closing, Dr. Glosser said that he felt there has to be significant changes in the Wholesome Meat Act in order to make this act enforceable.

REP. ELLERD then introduced Mr. Vern Sloulin, Food & Consumer Safety Bureau, DHES.

MR. SLOULIN indicated that any enforcing of these acts is done through local health departments. He said that at present they have 31 local health departments and they did make an honest effort to administer this law. What they attempted to do was have the health departments, at the time they were investigating for licensing a meat market and doing sanitation inspections, look for marketing and handling of foreign meat. None was uncovered during these inspections but that doesn't necessarily mean the meat wasn't there. It just wasn't visible. He agreed that \$10,000 was spent towards enforcing this law but there was no way to do an effective job because they can't trace the meat. The bill in its present form is not enforceable.

REP. ELLERD then asked the committee's permission to introduce a letter (EXHIBIT 3) from Cal Campbell, R.S., Supervisor, Food, Drug & Cosmetic Section, Food & Consumer Safety Bureau, DHES.

After reading the letter to the committee, Rep. Ellerd told the committee that if this law is not repealed, there will more than likely be an appropriation requested by DHES to attempt to further enforce it. Rep. Ellerd then made reference to Senator Baucus' bill (S.1038) and asked Mr. Sloulin to speak on it.

MR. SLOULIN indicated that he would like to pass the question on to Cal Campbell, Supervisor, Food & Consumer Safety Bureau.

MR. CAMPBELL said that Sen. Baucus' bill was one of 16 bills introduced to Congress on the subject of foreign meat problems. He further stated that the bill dealt with the problem at the national level with the USDA and U.S. Customs rather than after it gets into the states and the markets where it loses its identity.

REP. ELLERD then addressed the committee, requesting that they repeal an unenforceable law and pass a resolution that endorses Senator Baucus' efforts. Rep. Ellerd then indicated that he would like to close the discussion but felt there might be some more proponents or even opponents even though he couldn't see why anyone would oppose it.

CHAIRMAN SMITH then asked if there were anymore proponents.

MONS TEIGEN, of the Montana Stockgrower's Association and representing the Montana Cowbells asked to address the committee as a proponent. He said that the Stockgrower's Assoc. and the Cowbells were in support of H.B.#450 and HJR#17. He said 2 years ago they went along with the bill on Imported Meats even though they had reservations because they doubted that the State could cope with the Administration of it. Now they realize that the State can't handle it. He said they wanted to urge support of the two pieces of legislation. He also added that, he feels with C. W. McMillan, appointed to Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and being in a position to supervise meat in foreign trade, that we might get a more fair shake than we did before.

CHAIRMAN SMITH then called for anymore proponents

BILL ASHER, representing the Agricultural Preservation Association (APA), the Park County Legislative Association (PCLA), the Sweetgrass County Preservation Association (SCPA) and the Stillwater County Agricultural Legislative Association (SCALA). All four groups would like to be shown on the record as being in support of H.B.#450 and HJR#17.

He further stated that in 1979 Legislative Session, House Bill No. 251 was passed and has not been enforceable and these agencies would like to urge the committee to unclutter our statutes by eliminating this page of the Montana Codes.

CHAIRMAN SMITH then called for anymore proponents.

JIM GLOSSER said that he would like to go on record as being in support of HJR#17. He said he felt Sen. Baucus' bill approaches the problem and rightfully so because the Federal Government is the one that should be doing the monitoring of imported beef. Over the last two years there have been congressional hearings whereby there are classic examples of double standards and discriminatory policies about the Wholesome Meat Act. That is why Senator Baucus and other legislators have introduced legislation that would clearly require the Wholesome Meat Act to identify foreign beef, which would mean a pure product and also allow the jobbers, and packers to adequately label their products. He further urged the committee to give this their consideration and a do pass vote.

CHAIRMAN SMITH then asked if there were anymore proponents. Let the record show there were none.

CHAIRMAN SMITH then asked if there were any opponents.

JO BRUNNER, representing the Montana Cattlemen's Association, the Montana Cattle Feeders Organization and Women Involved in Farm Economics (W.I.F.E.). Ms. Brunner indicated that she had two statements to make. One against H.B.#450 (EXHIBIT 4) and one for HJR#17 which is a statement from Yvonne B. Snider, Beef Commodity Chairman, W.I.F.E. (EXHIBIT 5). Ms. Brunner said that in support of HJR#17, she speaks for W.I.F.E. alone.

CHAIRMAN SMITH then called for any further opponents.

TERRY MURPHY, President of the Montana Farmer's Union, headquarters in Great Falls, Montana. He said he was speaking on behalf of that organization and also on behalf of Forest Farris of Kalispell, Master of the Montana State Grange. Both organizations oppose passage of H.B.#450. They feel that HJR#17 should pass but feel that H.B.#450 should not be repealed until we know that a Federal law is going to be passed to take care of the situation. They feel that just because the law is difficult to administer and enforce is not a reason to repeal it. Eliminating the law is not going to cure the problem. Having a law on the books does not guarantee that people will not break it but it does guarantee that when they are caught they will be punished.

MR. MURPHY urged the committee not to repeal H.B.#450 until there was a federal law on the books that does take care of this problem.

CHAIRMAN SMITH then called for other opponents. Let the record show that there were no more opponents of H.B.#450, and Chairman Smith opened the discussion for questions from the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE ROUSH said he would like to ask a question of someone from the Department of Health and Environmental Sciences. He wanted to know if the State has made an attempt to enforce this law.

MR. SLOULIN, with DHES, stated that, yes, as he had mentioned to Rep. Ellerd in the letter from Cal Campbell, they had spent \$10,000 and encouraged local departments during their inspections and licensing to attempt to enforce this law.

REP. ROUSH then asked Mr. Sloulin if they have found places that have not been in compliance.

MR. SLOULIN replied that no, they have not actually found any evidence. They know there are places but they have not found it. So they have not been able to follow up with any enforcement.

REP. ROUSH then added, in other words, nobody has ever been fined.

MR. SLOULIN indicated that was right. He added further that there are jobbers from out of state that bring meat into Montana and there is no way of going back to those packing plants or suppliers in other states to follow through.

REP. ROUSH indicated that he would like to ask another question of DHES. He wanted to know if as long as this law wasn't enforceable, if it stayed on the books, did they have any intention of trying to enforce it, or would they just sit on it.

MR. CAMPBELL responded saying that he supposed they could do that but they are to report to the legislature each session and they are supposed to be doing something about enforcing it. He advised the committee that under his present funding and staffing, he would not be able to enforce this law. During the time this law has been in effect, they have not found anyone so they have not really been able to put this law into effect.

REP. ELLERD then asked a question of Vern Sloulin. What happens if this law stays on and we ask for an appropriation and can't get it. We will be asking Appropriations for more money to enforce a law that can't be enforced. How do you think Appropriations would view that?

CAL CAMPBELL responded to the question and indicated that he didn't feel they would be favorable in appropriating additional funds for this as compared to other things that DHES is responsible for that have been effective. He said that was just his personal opinion.

REPRESENTATIVE MANUEL asked Mr. Sloulin to refer to a report where one of the major grocery chains said they were discontinuing the use of imported fresh meat, and he wanted to know if Mr. Sloulin thought this was the result of the law on the books or not.

MR. SLOULIN said that he felt what was actually being referred to was a visit to one of the major grocery chains by the wives and the Cowbells. He indicated that he had spoke with one major store (Buttreys) and they indicated that was why they had discontinued use of foreign meat, not because of the law.

CHAIRMAN SMITH then called for anymore questions from the committee. Let the record show that there were no more questions and discussion on H.B.#450 and HJR#17 was closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

CHAIRMAN SMITH then called the committee into Executive Session at 1:05 p.m.

REPRESENTATIVE CONROY made a motion that House Bill No. 450 DO PASS. It was seconded and a roll call vote taken. Let the record show that all members voted AYE with Representatives Manuel, Bengtson, Jacobsen, and Holliday voting NO. House Bill #450 DO PASS.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBBINS then made a motion that House Joint Resolution #17 DO PASS. It was seconded by Representative Ernst and a roll call vote taken. Let the record show that the vote was unanimous for a DO PASS.

HOUSE BILL NO. 467

MR. BOB PERSON, Legislative Researcher, presented amendments to House Bill No. 467 for Representative Bob Sivertsen. He also handed out copies of the proposed amendments (EXHIBIT 6). He indicated that he had worked with Rep. Sivertsen on the amendments and they had been acceptable to Rep. Sivertsen. Roy Bjornson, Administrator, Plant Industries Division, Department of Agriculture, helped prepare the amendments and Bob Person said he thought they were o.k. but that he hadn't specifically commented on the final draft. Mr. Person further explained that one of the reasons for changing the word commission to committee would make it like the Wheat Committee. The amendments give them advisory power to the Department for rules. This has been changed throughout the text of the bill. Mr. Person then read the amendments, line by line, for the committee, for further clarification.

REPRESENTATIVE UNDERDAL then asked Mr. Person to clarify for him, as to his understanding that originally this was going to be a self-supporting committee, and was that still true.

MR. PERSON said yes, there was going to be no change in that.

REP. MANUEL then asked Bob if the section referred to on Page 9, line 8, subsection (3), was saying they expected to get the income from that or not.

MR. PERSON said no, he thought that would be pooled into the general fund.

REPRESENTATIVE JACOBSEN then asked how many producers subscribe to this, or how many people belong to this. He indicated that he wasn't here when the hearing was held.

MR. PERSON answered, approximately 120 to 150.

CHAIRMAN SMITH called for anymore question on H.B.#467. There were none. He then called for a motion on the amendments.

REP. UNDERDAL made a motion that the amendments DO PASS. It was seconded and let the record show that the vote in favor was unanimous.

REP. ROUSH then made a motion that House Bill No. 467 DO PASS AS AMENDED. It was seconded and let the record show the vote in favor was unanimous.

HOUSE BILL NO. 345

CHAIRMAN SMITH then asked Rep. Ellerd if he wanted to introduce House Bill #345 for discussion at this time.

REP. ELLERD said that he didn't know if he wanted to or not and said he would like to explain to the committee. He said that last night (2/10/81) there was a recommendation from the Attorney General's Office. It was not requested by Rep. Ellerd but somebody asked the Attorney General's opinion on this bill and asked him to make a ruling. Rep. Ellerd indicated that as far as he knew, nobody in the committee asked for a ruling but one was handed down. An opinion was requested on H.B.#800 but in addition, the Attorney General went further and also gave his opinion on House Bill #345. Rep. Ellerd further indicated that as far as he knew, there has never been an opinion rendered on pending legislation. Even though the Attorney General indicated that because the bill had not been enacted, his opinion was only "advisory", he was in fact making a ruling on pending legislation in H.B.#345. Rep. Ellerd did indicate that he was going to ask for a ruling on this statement. He said he felt that the Attorney General could not give an opinion on pending legislation but was going to get a ruling before he took any further action.

CHAIRMAN SMITH then asked Rep. Ellerd if he would like the committee to hold this bill a little longer. Rep. Ellerd said yes, until he was able to get a ruling as to whether this was in line or not. Chairman Smith said they would hold it.

CHAIRMAN SMITH indicated there would be no meeting on Friday but Monday, 2/16 the committee would take executive action on Senate Bill #4 and Representative Lund's House Bill No. 640.

REP. CONROY then moved for adjournment. It was seconded and the meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.


Chairman Carl M. Smith

/lml

General Provisions

50-35-101. Findings and purpose. The legislature finds that sanitary meat inspection standards in other meat producing nations cannot be guaranteed to be equal to the standards applied to the inspection of American meat and declares that the purpose of this chapter is to protect the public health and safety by placing Montana consumers on notice of the possibility of lower inspection standards in such other nations.

History: En. 27-320 by Sec. 3, Ch. 415, L. 1975; R.C.M. 1947, 27-320.

50-35-102. Stores to ascertain origin of fresh meat. Any grocery store or similar establishment selling fresh meat at retail shall, if possible, ascertain the origin of all fresh meat which it offers for sale. Such information shall be provided by the supplier of such meat at the time of delivery if reasonably available to the supplier.

History: En. 27-318 by Sec. 1, Ch. 415, L. 1975; R.C.M. 1947, 27-318(part).

50-35-103. Labeling requirement for foreign meat. On meat produced outside the United States of America, the store or supplier of fresh meat shall place the words "FOREIGN MEAT" or "MEAT FROM (country of origin)" in prominent letters upon the package in which such meat is sold to the consumer or store. If the country of origin of foreign meat is unknown, the words "COUNTRY OF ORIGIN UNKNOWN" shall be placed upon the package in like manner.

History: En. 27-318 by Sec. 1, Ch. 415, L. 1975; R.C.M. 1947, 27-318(part); amd. Sec. 1, Ch. 278, L. 1979.

50-35-104. Penalty. A person in charge of a grocery store or similar establishment or a supplier of fresh meat who knowingly fails to comply with the provisions of this chapter by willfully failing to label foreign meat or provide information under the provisions of this chapter commits a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined not less than \$200 or more than \$500.

History: En. 27-319 by Sec. 2, Ch. 415, L. 1975; R.C.M. 1947, 27-319; amd. Sec. 2, Ch. 278, L. 1979.

50-35-105. Biennial report. The department of health and environmental sciences shall report to the legislature on all efforts taken to enforce compliance with the provisions of this part at the beginning of each regular legislative session.

History: En. Sec. 3, Ch. 278, L. 1979.

I M P O R T E D M E A T S

TITLE 50, CHAPTER 35 MCA

R E P O R T T O T H E L E G I S L A T U R E

by

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
FOOD & CONSUMER SAFETY BUREAU

IMPORTED MEATS

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this information is to provide a report to Legislature as to administration of the Imported Meat Act (50-35-103, MCA) by the Department of Health and Environmental Sciences. This report also includes the role of thirty local health departments which are involved in licensing and inspection of retail markets.

The Department of Health and Environmental Sciences is not only involved with retail meat markets through the Imported Meat Act, but also through the Food Establishment Act (50-50-201, MCA) which requires an annual license. This law provides for annual inspections which are made by local health department sanitarians.

II. HISTORY

The 1977 legislature passed the Imported Meat Act in an attempt to limit the use of imported meats within the state of Montana. The Act was passed at that time with the understanding from the sponsors that the law was not completely enforceable, since the Department of Health was not and could not be involved with the suppliers or the processors of meat. The 1979 legislature amended the law to include raising the penalty for failure to comply and require the Department of Health & Environmental Sciences to report enforcement efforts to the legislature.

III. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES ACTIVITIES

Immediately after the last legislature the County Health Department sanitarians were requested to inspect for fresh foreign imported meats in retail markets (see addendum No. 1). The Department of Health & Environmental Sciences also prepared news articles that were printed in various food industry publications (copy enclosed) and newspapers.

In November, 1979 a copy of the act was mailed to all retail markets with the annual license renewal notice. (See addendum No. 2)

Since the beginning the Department was informed of three in-state and numerous out-of-state meat suppliers that were selling fresh imported meats in Montana. One of the large grocery store chains informed the Department that they were discontinuing the use of imported fresh meat. (See addendum No. 3) The other large chains provided information that they would not use any imported meats as long as it was processed within the state; however, they could not promise that foreign meat was not used when the meat for the stores was processed out-of-state. Numerous follow-up inquiries were made through the local departments to monitor the program. Additional information was provided to the local health departments throughout the period at the annual spring and fall sanitarians' educational conferences.

IV. LOCAL HEALTH DEPARTMENTS' ACTIVITIES

The local health departments started looking for foreign meat when they made routine sanitation inspections of the retail markets. Local health departments were informed that suppliers were providing fresh imported meat. No imported meat was confirmed in the 600 retail markets.

V. U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE REQUIREMENTS

The U. S. Department of Agriculture Meat Inspection Service has jurisdiction over all Montana meat processing plants. There is specific intention to separate the Department of Health & Environmental Sciences' jurisdiction with suppliers from the jurisdiction of the Montana Department of Livestock and the USDA. The Federal Act specifically preempts the state having requirements differing from the Federal Act.

The Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 USC 620) allows meat processors to process foreign meat. When the plants grind and/or cut imported meat it loses its identity as to the source of origin. The meat is placed in the packing plant's own cartons and it is identified as their product (regardless of point of origin). This is in compliance with USDA inspection practices according to Moise Waguespack, D.V.M., USDA Area Supervisor, Federal Building, Butte.

The retail meat markets are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health & Environmental Sciences (Chapter 50, Section 50, MCA). MCA 50-50-102 includes food manufacturing establishments but excludes slaughter houses and meat packing plants. MCA 81-9-202 of the Department of Livestock states that slaughter houses and packing plants are exempt from the Department of Health & Environmental Sciences insofar as the business of production, storage, or transportation of those food products is concerned.

VI. FUTURE EFFORTS

Local health department sanitarians will continue to be alert for fresh imported meats when they conduct routine sanitation inspections. If additional effort is required it should be pointed out that additional funding will be necessary. The Department of Health & Environmental Sciences has been informed that 16 individual bills have been introduced into the U. S. Congress concerning the imported meat problem. Senator Max Baucus is sponsor of one of those bills (addendum No. 4).

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The present law has not been enforceable, since the processors can circumvent state law under the USDA law. It is estimated that local and state governments have spent up to \$10,000. Neither the State Department of Health & Environmental Sciences nor any local health department has been able to confirm the presence of foreign meat in any of the 600 retail markets in Montana.

Vern Sloulin

Department of Health and Environmental Sciences
STATE OF MONTANA HELENA, MONTANA 59611

October 27, 1980

A. C. Knight M.D. F.C.C.P.
Director

Representative Robert Ellerd
Box 636
Bozeman, Montana 59715

Dear Representative Ellerd:

This letter is to confirm your conversation with Vern Sloulin concerning a marketing of foreign meat in Montana.

Immediately after the last session of the legislature, we notified all of the County Sanitariums to inspect for foreign meats in the retail markets. The following November we mailed a copy of the act to inform all retail markets of the law. Since the beginning we were informed that three in-state and out-of-state packing plants (under USDA inspection and jurisdiction) were selling foreign fresh meat in Montana. The local Health Departments were trying to locate the foreign meat in the retail markets. They didn't find any!

We telephoned the packing plants to find out why they weren't labelling the foreign beef. The packing plants informed us that they were complying with the law. We then contacted the USDA (Dr. Moise Waguespack, USDA Office, Butte). He informed us that if foreign meat is processed then it doesn't have to be labelled as to the country of origin. The packing plants were either grinding or cutting the meat to constitute processing and not informing their customers. This complies with USDA requirements. The packing plants are under the jurisdiction of USDA and the Department of Livestock. They are exempt from the Department of Health licensing laws (Chapter 50, Section 50, Montana Code Annotated).

It is our opinion that the foreign meat act is not enforceable within the state. The law and enforcement needs to be on the national level to prevent the slaughterhouses and packing plants from circumventing the law as they do in the state of Montana. It has been a frustrating experience to try to administer this law.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact Vern Sloulin or myself.

Sincerely,



Cal Campbell, R.S., Supervisor
Food, Drug and Cosmetic Section
Food & Consumer Safety Bureau

CC/ns

NAME Jo Brunner BILL No. HB 450
ADDRESS Helena DATE 2/11
WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT W.I.F.E.
SUPPORT _____ OPPOSE x AMEND _____
PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

Women Involved in Farm Economics wished to go on record in opposition of this bill.

The Montana Codes mentioned here for repealing---50-35-101, thru 50-35-105, are the very protection our American consumer ^{needs} ~~uses~~ to ascertain the origin, quality and freshness of the meat they purchase.

~~The livestock industry~~ ^{W.I.F.E.} has supported in the past, bills that bring this protection to the consumer and to the livestock industry.

W.I.F.E. feels that it is necessary for our producers to abide ^{that} by the sanitation laws, and our processors do also. Foreign countries bringing meats to our people should have the same criteria of health standards ^{on their ~~meats~~ products} as we do. Labeling allows the consumer the freedom of choice and informs them of the origin of the product they purchase.

We find no reason to remove these standards.

Thank you,

Montana W.I.F.E. strongly supports the passage of HJR 17 which urges the passage of Senate Bill 1038 as introduced by Senator Max Baucus. This bill, which would strengthen the inspection laws and require labeling of imported meat, is long overdue.

Three reasons for support of this legislation are:

1. It would guarantee to American consumers that all meat offered for sale has been inspected and met the requirements of USDA specifications.
2. It would give American consumers a choice between buying imported meat or domestically produced meat products, the same choice they have in selecting clothing, cars, cameras, sewing machines, toys and other consumer products.
3. It would give the American livestock industry a fair shake in dealing competitively with meat producers of other nations. The compliance to rigid inspection laws is expensive for American meat-packing firms, pushing their costs above the competition which does not have to comply with the same rigid requirements. Passage of Senate Bill 1038 would help to equalize the competition.

We commend the State Legislature for supporting our livestock industry with HRJ 17 and urge its passage.

Yvonne B. Snider
Beef Commodity Chairman
Women Involved in Farm Economics

HOUSE Agriculture COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE

Date _____

[illegible]

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

NAME Tom Murphy BILL No. HB 450
ADDRESS Great Falls DATE 9-11-51
WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT Montana Farmers Union and Grange
SUPPORT _____ OPPOSE _____ AMEND _____

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

I am Tom Murphy, President of Montana Farmers Union, also speaking for Forest Farm of Kalispell, Master of The Montana State Grange. Both organizations oppose passage of HB 450.

NAME Philip Franklin BILL No. HF 425
ADDRESS Helena DATE 2/11/81
WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT Montana National Farmers Organization
SUPPORT Montana Cattlemen's Association OPPOSE AMEND

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

Bliss F. Franklin

NAME Jim Gussow BILL No. HB 950
ADDRESS Helena, MT DATE 5/10/81
WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT MT DEPT. OF LIVESTOCK
SUPPORT X OPPOSE _____ AMEND _____

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

EXISTING STATUTE IS IMPOSIBLE TO ADMINISTER AND
ENFORCE IN VIEW OF THE CURRENT PROCEDURES USED
BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN ACCEPTING IMPORTS TO
BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE U.S. WHOLESALE MEAT ACT
OF 1967.

NAME BILL ASHER BILL No. HB 450
ADDRESS MANHATTAN DATE FEB. 11, 1981
WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT SEE BELOW
SUPPORT ✓ OPPOSE _____ AMEND _____

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

REPRESENTING: AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION ASSOCIATION
PARK COUNTY LEGISLATIVE ASSOCIATION
SWEETGRASS COUNTY PRESERVATION ASSOCIATION
STILLWATER COUNTY AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATIVE ASSOCIATION

VISITORS' REGISTER

HOUSE *Agreement* COMMITTEE

RTLL HJR 17

Date 2/11/81

SPONSOR Ellen D

[illegible]

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR LONGER FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

NAME Wm. G. Grosse BILL No. HR 17
ADDRESS HAVER, ME DATE 2/1/81
WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT 1st DEPT. OF LIVERMORE
SUPPORT X OPPOSE _____ AMEND _____

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

Congressional change in legislation is needed
to eliminate the double standard imposed by H&D.
Return state inspected meat of US cattle as imported
foreign beef.

NAME Mons Teigen ^{HSR 17}
ADDRESS Heleni ^{House} BILL No. 450
WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT Mont. Stockgrowers Assn. DATE 2/11/81
SUPPORT ☒ OPPOSE ☐ AMEND ☐ ^{ML Conbelle}

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

NAME BILL ASHER BILL No. HJR 17
ADDRESS MANHATTAN DATE FEB. 11, 1981
WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT SEE BELOW
SUPPORT ✓ OPPOSE AMEND

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

REPRESENTING: AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION ASSOCIATION
PARK COUNTY LEGISLATIVE ASSOCIATION
SWEETGRASS COUNTY PRESERVATION ASSOCIATION
STILLWATER COUNTY AGRICULTURAL ~~ASSOCIATION~~ LEGISLATIVE ASSOCIATION

AGRICULTURE

ROLL CALL VOTE ---

COMMITTEE

	Date: 2/11 No: HB-450	Date: 2/11 No: HJR-17	Date: 2/11 No: HB-467	Date: No:	Date: No:	Date: No:
SMITH	Yes	Yes	Yes			
SCHULTZ	Yes	Yes	Yes			
ERNST	Yes	Yes	Yes			
JENSEN	Yes	Yes	Yes			
ELLERD	Yes	Yes	Yes			
RYAN	Yes	Yes	Yes			
FEDA	Yes	Yes	Yes			
BRIGGS	Absent	Absent	Absent			
UNDERDAL	Yes	Yes	Yes			
MC LANE	Yes	Yes	Yes			
MANUEL	NO	Yes	Yes			
BENGTSON	NO	Yes	Yes			
JACOBSEN	NO	Yes	Yes			
ROBBINS	Yes	Yes	Yes			
HOLLIDAY	NO	Yes	Yes			
ROUSH	Yes	Yes	Yes			
CONROY	Yes	Yes	Yes			