

CLERK: Roll call vote on page 612 of the Journal. 25 ayes, 20 nays, Mr. President, 5 excused and not voting.

PRESIDENT: The bill is advanced. There is a motion to raise the call by Senator Goodrich. Record your vote on that proposition. Record.

CLERK: 22 ayes to raise the call.

PRESIDENT: The call is raised. An oral motion to move the A bill please, Senator Cullan.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature. I make a motion to move LB 220A to E & R.

PRESIDENT: You've heard the motion. All in favor say aye, contrary say nay. The motion carries.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature. I move that the E & R amendments to LB 129 be adopted.

CLERK: The E & R amendments to 129 have been adopted. There is an amendment offered by Senator Lamb which was adopted. There is a motion by Senator Frank Lewis to indefinitely postpone which was laid over.

PRESIDENT: Senator Frank Lewis.

SENATOR F. LEWIS: Mr. President. I move that LB 129 be indefinitely postponed for the following reasons. No bill has created more controversy in the Nebraska Legislature than that of last year in raising the license fees for every hunter and fisherman in the state of Nebraska. Those amounts are substantial now at the level of about \$21. The purpose was for improving habitat. The way for improvement of habitat somewhat over my objection was to do that through license fees of hunters and fishermen. That money and that collection has started for that particular purpose. Now 129 comes back and really provides a bill for weekend hunters and weekend fishermen right now, probably soon to be weekend hunters, which destroys the original concept of what the bill was. I was not overwhelmingly happy with the bill last year as you know, but certainly now to reduce the revenues and reduce the resources the way this bill has turned into with the Lamb amendment, I see no other recourse. I see no other recourse than to kill the bill or subsequently reduce the amount to all hunters and all fishermen in the state. I thought about drawing up an amendment to making it \$3 for fishing and \$3 for hunting and \$1 for the habitat stamp or the Upland Game Stamp, but I decided that was not the viable solution. The Mills amendment or the Mills part of it I could understand in terms of some people coming in for a \$10 three-day trip, but for three days resident fishing, which I don't know of any other example, I think that will significantly depreciate the revenues we have available particularly in that area that everybody wanted them for. That was for habitat, so Mr. Chairman with those remarks in mind I tell you that this bill is defeating what the bill last year was for and the cost again is going to remain the same for those people who are multiple time hunters and fishermen. By multiple times, that's two or three or four or more which most hunters and most fishermen are. It depletes the revenue and it resolves no problem. I'd ask that you kill 129.