

public but a kind of private game preserve, if you would, any area like that is called a controlled shooting area under current law, and there has to be five miles between the location of these controlled shooting areas, they have to be spaced out from one another at least five miles apart. And there are certain purported policy reasons for that. And this law, of course, is supported by all those who own these controlled shooting areas, private areas right now, and these are largely the owners of commercial controlled shooting areas. Now, the committee amendments, what they do is first of all take this concept of controlled shooting area and divide it into two parts. One is called commercial controlled shooting areas, and the other is private controlled shooting areas. And as you might guess, the commercial areas are areas where...run by people who stock the area with birds and then allow you to come in and hunt for a fee, okay? That's oversimplifying a little bit, but that's the basic concept. The other kind that we're distinguishing with the committee amendment are the private controlled shooting areas, and in this instance the public is again excluded and they don't let people come in and hunt for a fee, but they are typically owned by companies who invite clientele and customers and do some of their marketing by bringing people in to hunt for free on their private hunting grounds. Okay? So the committee amendment separated those two types of controlled shooting areas. And then the committee amendment went on to say with regard to the five mile rule between these areas, that that five mile rule would be retained insofar as commercial, commercial shooting areas are concerned. Okay? But with regard to private controlled shooting areas the five mile limitation would be eliminated so that a private area could be located anywhere with respect to another private area, or it could be located anywhere with respect to an existing commercial area. That was the compromise that was worked out with the committee amendment and that particular compromise was supported by those who wanted to see change in the protected, established turf of the commercial areas, wanted to see a loosening of the law. One of the policy decisions you have to make is whether there's any rationale at all for the five-mile rule or for some other rule or for distance between one or another of these types of controlled shooting areas. Okay. The committee didn't go far enough in the sense...on this question, in the sense that we apparently did not resolve all of the conflicts out there. And Senator Hudkins had to work further to resolve conflicts between the owners of these commercial establishments and those who are interested in looser controls.