

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

January 13, 2000 LB 788

it's still okay for the officers to use their own money and then get reimbursed by Game and Parks. So, gee, I don't think this is very controversial. I hope I've explained it adequately, but, if you have any questions, I would try and answer it. And I think we have somebody who may have a question, and I maybe can't answer it, but there are people in the Rotunda that probably can. But, with that, I will...I will conclude my opening remarks and that's what this is all about.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body. I do, Senator Schrock, indeed have a question about the bill. And what I'm concerned about is the interaction of two different provisions in the bill. On page 2, line 4, we see that "The fund shall be funded through revenue collected under the Game Law". Now I'm...first of all, I'm uncertain if that is the fines and penalties that are assessed against individuals for violation of the Game Law, for example, not wearing hunter orange, et cetera? Normally, I would expect those things to go to the temporary School Fund. If it is, on the other hand, the liquidated damages that are sometimes assessed against individuals, for example, for taking a deer or for other activities, I've never quite known where that money went. But, if that's the money that we're talking about, I guess I would like to know that. If it is dollars that are derived from maybe the sale of confiscated weapons, because that also happens in some game violations, I would also like to know that. The other...and in conjunction with knowing exactly where or what is contemplated under "revenue collected under the Game Law" as a potential funding source, I'm also interested in the interaction of that potential funding source with the provisions, on line 21 and 22, that says the funds can be used for salaries and expenses of agents and informants. And the reason I'm interested in the interaction of those two provisions is I have always tried to be wary of provisions that "incented", in the form of salaries or other benefits, persons to enforce the law, because in that context they are enforcing the law for their benefit, not for the benefit of the state or the benefit of all of us. Their responsibility is to enforce the law for all of us, for the state. They don't need to be induced to enforce the law for their personal benefit. And if I'm wrong about the