

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

April 12, 2005      LB 673

this plan, why, it's not mandatory. It's something they can adopt and, of course, again I would support Senator Beutler's amendment to the Agriculture amendment, AM0867. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SHEEHY: Thank you, Senator Louden. Senator Chambers, you're recognized on FA161.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I again support Senator Beutler's amendment. It appears that some good work is being done on the floor that may have been done in the committee, except that it apparently was believed that by taking language from the noxious weed bill and just bringing it over here into this bill dealing with living animals would be sufficient and acceptable. But it is not. I've been talking about some things that go to an attitude that I have toward living things, the incompetency of government, and the attempt by the conservatives in the Nebraska Legislature to shift onto individual property owners that which is the responsibility of the state. And I think this ought to be declared forthrightly in the name of this bill, and I'm going to offer an amendment to that effect. There is not truth in labeling in this bill. If you look at page 1 of the committee amendment, beginning in line 3 it says, "Sections 1 to 13 of this act shall be known and may be cited as the Black-Tailed Prairie Dog Management Act." No, no. It should be called "dump the state's responsibility on the individual landowner act." That is what you're doing. Why, if you have the gall to do something, don't you have the honesty to call it what it is? If you didn't know before the exchange between Senator Louden and me that wild animals belong to the state, you know it now. The state has the final say-so as to what a person is allowed to do with these wild animals. The state, as the owner, has the responsibility. This bill says that a landowner has certain responsibilities by virtue of being the owner of the land. So if the landowner, by virtue of being the owner of the land, is going to have to assume certain responsibilities relative to that land, why are you not going to apply the principle to the state and say that the state, by virtue of being the owner of these wild animals, has the responsibility to do whatever the state feels is necessary to be done with them? And the state should bear the cost. But you all don't want to bear the cost.