

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

January 13, 2004 LR 4

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Time, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Senator Preister.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise to explain how I'm going to not vote for this constitutional amendment. And I'm not sure what I'm going to do with Senator Chambers' amendment to it at this point. But I serve in the Natural Resources Committee, as most of you here know, and I did not vote this out of committee. It's not because I don't think people should be able to hunt or fish, or trap, for that matter, although I think there certainly should be some regulation of how that's done. My position is one that, if this were opportunity to put in statute this privilege, this right, I would support it, but to put it in the constitution makes absolutely no sense to me. The constitution is a broad-based document that sets out direction. It doesn't get this specific. It already states that people have a right to happiness. And if happiness is hunting for them, then that right is certainly in the constitution. But to spell out that they have this right to trap, and to, I think, further muddy our state constitution, which we have already done in the past, probably more than I think is necessary, in my view, is not something that I can support or put in to the constitution. And I don't think we should, despite this list of reasons that Senator Schrock gives to us. He lists a number of things on there, and they're reasons to protect some of these rights, perhaps. But I don't see any reason there that would compel me to vote to put this in our state constitution. That's a pretty drastic step, in my view, something very serious that should be taken very seriously. And I'm glad that we're going to have some extended discussion of it. Nebraska is not a state where animal rights people have much of a voice in the first place, and where it's very likely that any kind of attempt to really restrict hunting and fishing would likely get even a half dozen votes out of this body, and probably not get much more than that in future successive bodies. This isn't California, this isn't other states where people are likely to be able to get a Legislature to take very restrictive actions. It was, I believe, about