

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

January 13, 2004 LR 4

conflict there.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. And if at some future point in time for whatever reason the Game and Parks Commission decided to maybe to take one bird off the game list, either temporarily or permanently, would you envision that as being a reasonable restriction?

SENATOR SCHROCK: I have a lot of confidence in the people that serve on that commission, and I don't think they'd take it off unless there was a good reason.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. And a good reason, in your mind, would be, for example, if the species itself were threatened or endangered?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Correct.

SENATOR BEUTLER: So the intention of this language is not really...doesn't really have any relationship as such to the whole concepts of threatened and endangered species?

SENATOR SCHROCK: I don't think it pertains to threatened species because I don't think...I think that would be prohibiting the hunting or taking of endangered species certainly is reasonable regulation.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yeah. So if the endangered species were a game animal of some type, as for example with Rocky Mountain sheep, they used to be...you were prohibited from hunting those up until recently. Was that a reasonable thing for Game and Parks to do?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Certainly.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. And so if once again, because they were diseased or had some population problem or were otherwise endangered, it wouldn't be contrary to your intent with respect to this constitutional amendment to prohibit Game and Parks from doing that. Would that be correct?