

LB 241.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: LB 241 advances. LB 209.

CLERK: LB 209, Madam President, a bill by Senator Hudkins. (Read title.) The bill was introduced on January 9 of this year, at that time was referred to the Natural Resources Committee. The bill was advanced to General File. There are committee amendments pending by Natural Resources.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Chair recognizes Senator Beutler to open on the committee amendments.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I hope this bill doesn't take a lot of our time because it really doesn't represent any major policy decisions. It is really a kind of turf battle, and I think as you listen to it more and more you'll see why it is. What the bill does, first of all, what the committee amendments do, first of all, is to combine two bills. What I would like to do for you here is not go through the technicalities of all the committee amendments but rather try to set in what I hope is an objective way what the parameters of the debate will be here and what the one or two items that are worthy of some discussion are. What the bill...what the committee amendments does in the first instance is to combine two bills. One is Senator Hudkins' priority bill, 209, and we combined into that a Game and Parks bill, LB 576, which was a cleanup bill dealing with a myriad of technical provisions relating to what we call controlled shooting areas and other kinds of controlled game devices related to controlled shooting areas and the raising of wild birds by those who raise them for purposes of hunting them then subsequently. So most...the committee amendments are huge. Senator Hudkins' amendment, which will come directly after this and would amend the committee amendments, is also large. It is large because of all the...they both are large because of all the technical details, but there is really one central question that you have to decide which is more important, much more important than any of the other small details, all of which could probably go one way or another and none of us would really care much. But the central question is this, and if you can get the central question I think you can follow the debate. The central question has to do with the location of these controlled shooting areas. Now the first thing, under current law any area 'hat's a controlled' shooting area, that is not open to the