

because it doesn't say where it fits into the bill, it doesn't say how it exempts them from liability, what standard of liability we will have. It simply doesn't work. But, you know, that's not the main objection to this. The main objection is the same objection I have to the main amendment. I mean, who...what are these people? Are these some kind of criminals or something that they don't deserve the same standard of care, the same standard of liability. I mean, because they come from the city are they open season? Do you put them on a carnival stand and shoot at them and see which ones you can knock down? I mean, really, we have one standard of liability for all of our citizens, a standard of negligence, a standard of due care. I have nothing more to say about the Haberman amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Wehrbein, did you wish to address the Haberman amendment?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes, Mr. President, members. I, real briefly, Senator Haberman, how would this differ from an ordinary hunting situation in an open territory in western Nebraska or South Dakota?

SENATOR HABERMAN: Well, as I...okay, I'll try to explain it to you, Senator. As I understand it, possibly the fees from the game stamp is going to be used to plant shrubbery, to plant trees and to make this a game haven. That's why the Game and Parks are going to more or less be in charge of it. So whenever you take a long stretch and make it a game haven, you're going to attract more game than if it's in a regular agriculture field or a regular shelter belt because it goes mile, after mile, after mile, and these animals become used to it. Deer, skunks, opossum, whatever there is, it's is maybe going to be their first home, so I'm trying to explain to you and I hope you agree that it will be an attraction to game and it would be more dangerous than just a regular hunting place.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Well, I understand that. My point is I don't know whether we can set a different standard for a hunter here than we could in an ordinary hunting situation and that concerns me. I do support the amendment. My concern is that we're taking it a little too far in holding a hunter harmless any more than he may be now under ordinary hunting circumstances on a regular open field that would not concern a trail. That's my only concern. I would like to hope that the amendment itself, the original amendment, would pass because I think it's