

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Stuhr.

SENATOR STUHR: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Stuhr, did you vote for that so-called hunters' rights bill, where you could not interfere with hunters?

SENATOR STUHR: I can't recall if I did or not.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, thank you. I'd like to ask Senator Hudkins the same question. Senator Hudkins, do you remember whether you voted for the hunters' rights bill, or whatever it was called?

SENATOR HUDKINS: No, I do not remember.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Hmm, Senator Schrock is not here. I bet by the time I get through going down the list there were not enough votes to pass that bill. Senator Landis and I were the only two who voted no. But here is what I'm trying to get at, and I can see where it would be slightly discomfoting to have to say that you put in the law a provision that says hunters cannot be interfered with when they're tracking and shooting these animals, but you don't want to put into the law a proviso to protect adjoining landowners. There's a great inconsistency there to my way of thinking. Senator Preister is bringing a rational and worthwhile amendment. But I'd like to ask him a question. Senator Preister.

SENATOR PREISTER: Yes, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Would you be willing to amend your amendment to strike subsection (c), and you'll at least pick up Senator Jones' vote, the part that talks about the future development and expansion?

SENATOR PREISTER: Well, Senator Chambers, I appreciate your continuing role as the peacemaker, and I would...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR PREISTER: ...certainly be willing to get what I can get out of the amendments for the benefit of those people.