

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

February 3, 2000 LB 701

money available to the commission, and that's probably a good...good thing to add to the bill. As far as the first part of the Schrock amendment, if my amendment was...was to be attached, the Bill Drafter would have to reconcile those two, but there's not that much difference. But I think it's important again to point out that what I'm making is probably a concession that is more valuable to all of the parties concerned than what...than what the amendment...the committee amendment is, because what it does, it strikes the language that leaves in place the railroad fence law, that states that where a single landowner's property is divided they still must, according to AMO719, they still must provide a railroad fence. What I'm telling you this morning, that this amendment that will follow Schrock's amendment strikes that language and makes the type of fence the fence that is agreed to between the landowner and the Game and Parks Commission representatives, whether it is a boundary fence or an interior fence. Whether it is a boundary fence or an interior fence, it allows the landowner, if they're concerned, and it may be right outside of Valentine, might be, might be concerned about potential liability and might not think that a hot wire or a legal fence or whatever is good enough. But I do not think that we should make those decisions, that reduce the protection of the landowner, here in the Legislature. I think that that landowner ought to have that opportunity, and they ought to have that opportunity whether it is a boundary fence or a situation where the trail divides someone's pasture or farm field. I think we need to get that point particularly clear. I'm not going to stand in opposition to the Schrock amendment, but I do stand in opposition to the underlying committee amendment, unless we can add the Cattlemen's concession, for lack of a better...better word, and where they want to have a voice in, be the instigator of whether there is a fence and, if there is a fence, what type of fence that might be. Because I will tell you this morning that what Senator Schrock said is not necessarily in error. Because if I happen to be in a situation where I was raising dryland wheat, I wouldn't be altogether enthused about having any sort of a fence in that area, because a fence that doesn't serve a purpose is a nuisance. And I think my amendment, which is coming after the Schrock amendment, will in fact provide us with a provision in statute, if adopted to the committee amendment, that will balance the issue in a way that is much more favorable to both