

Assembly

2

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE 56TH ASSEMBLY SESSION

MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 1971 ROOM # 320

MEMBERS PRESENT: CHAIRMAN: Virgil Getto, Frances Hawkins, Norman Glaser, Roy Young, Roy Torvinen, William Swackhamer, Melvin Howard

GUESTS: Mr. Lee Burge, Director of Department of Agriculture; Harry Galloway, Director of Planning Industry; Mr. Charlie Frey, Mr. Ira H. Kent, Mrs. Mortar, Mr. Scott.

Chairman Getto called the meeting to order to 9:45 a.m.

The first business before the committee was BDR 288\*; Mr. Glaser made the following statement regarding the draft:

This resolution is based on a study that the State Land Law Committee conducted last year. It indicated at the time that we were about six million acres short from what we should have gotten from the Federal Government. They sent doctrines of this to the Congressional Delegation to solicit their support. I thought it might be helpful if we followed this up with a resolution to the State of Nevada. Now, in this resolution it indicates that the land, if the Congress should see fit to cede to the State of Nevada is roughly six million acres, that I feel they still owe us. That this land be dedicated to the permanent school fund and any of this land, if it should be sold; if it went out from under state control, that is, if the state decided they needed it for parks or recreation or city expansion or anything like this, it would be kept in those entities, but if it goes out from under state control and is sold, that money be diticated to the permenant school fund as the resolution indicates, and I would like to have Committee introduction and referred to the Committee.

Mr. Swackhamer moved to have Committee introduction on BDR 288, seconded by Mr. Howard. Motion carried.

\*A.J.R. 12

The second resolution discussed was BDR C-399:

Mr. Glaser commented on this resolution; It arises from a situation that developed about six years ago in which the Legislature passed a law stating, that in the event land around the metropolitan areas, primarily around the Truckee meadows and Washoe County, in the event it is assessed as agriculture land, in the event it was sold for subdivision purposes it would be assessed as subdivision land and at that time the Assessor would go back a period of 5 or 6 years and pick up the differential in taxes. Subsequently this was challenged by someone in the Supreme Court of the State and it was ruled unconstitutional. The Constitution requires that all taxation shall be equal. As a result of this, I had this Bill drafted that would amend the Constitution to allow differential assessment. Now, this has been in some other states. In my particular county I don't think there is any real problem, there could be, and there could be in some of these other areas, particularly where you have metropolitan areas growing up fast adjacent to agriculture land.

Discussion by the Committee, and Mr. Swackhamer was against the resolution. Mr. Glaser moved for Committee introduction of BDR C-399, seconded by Miss Hawkins, 5 ayes, 2 no, the motion was lost.

The next order of business was AB 96, 97, 98, 99:

AB 96: Changes requirements relating to registration and inspection of apiaries.

Mr. Lee Burge and Mr. Harry Galloway gave testimony on AB 96:

Mr. Burge: This apiary Bill for amendments to the present law. The bee industry is a very important part of our overall seed industry .

We haven't had success in bringing non-resident bees into the State under permit, and it is our obligation not to only protect our native bees, but those 25 or 30 thousand colonies that come in, to see that they are clean against any disease. What this Bill does is give us a better knowledge of knowing where these bees are. The first amendment there gives us 10 days after obtaining possession so we would know if you sold your bees to somebody else within 10 days we should know about where they are located; To amend Section 3, it was brought to our attention by the District Attorney of Humboldt County where an individual overstayed the time of his permit, this simply says he cannot stay beyond his permit; Sub Section 5, which deals with the disease rate, the present law says that if there is 1% disease found in the apiary it shall be quarantined.

Mr. Galloway: The problem now is, the law at the present time says that on or before May 1st of each year all owners of Bees will register their colonies and their locations, then after May 1st change of ownership and so forth we know nothing about it unless we accidentally stumble across it until they re-register the following year, so this would require that a person who bought bees or or brought packaged bees from out of state, brought them into the state, or bought from another man from within the state would register it, so we would know the ownership and the location of those bees.

Mr. Swackhamer had a question regarding Sec. 3 line 25; It is unlawful for any person who ships or transports into the State of Nevada any bees, used beehives, honeycombs or appliances, except queens or bees in screened cages without comb under a permit issued pursuant to NRS 552.210, to keep such bees, used beehives, honeycombs or appliances in the state after the expiration of such permit; what is the law on that now?

Mr. Galloway: The only change there, the only thing added there really is to the indication that after the expiration of the application of the permit for small counties where an individual brought his bees in on a 6 months permit, at the end of that 6 months permit the bees remained in the state, they were more or less in an abandoned neglected condition and when we attempted to prosecute and enforce the removal of the bees from the state, the District

Attorney, and followed up by the Attorney General's office interpreted that we did not have legal authority, in fact, there was no condition in the law to retain the bees in the state after the expiration of the permit. So this is what this is for-- to require that it is a violation of the law, that upon the expiration of the permit, we could enforce the removal of the bees.

AB 97: Summary: Increases registration fee on economic poisons.

Mr. Burge and Mr. Galloway gave testimony on this bill and the committee had discussion; Mr. Glaser moved to Do Pass, seconded, motion carried.

AB 98: Summary: Increases tonnage license fees on sale of commercial fertilizers and agricultural minerals.

Committee agreed on a Do Pass with an amendment.

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

b smithers