

we talked about this on the grandfather clause, but could you refresh for us why we grandfather in these wild animals that are out there now? I know there is a reason but I can't remember.

SENATOR RUPP: Well, I mentioned it briefly in the committee amendments, again, that was approached in the committee amendments. If we were to not grandfather in existing animals, there would be a value on that animal that the state would have to reimburse that person. First of all, there would probably be a considerable expenditure of funds because everyone that has an animal that is prohibited, if they had to give up that animal now, they would apply a claim to the state and then we would get into considerable controversy whether an African lion is worth \$15.00 or \$15,000, or a cougar is worth this, that or the other, and rather than have the great hassle of, first of all, finding probably considerable amount of money to reimburse these people for going out and taking their animal away now, and also hashing out what the value might be, they would get attached sentimental value, we have had...this has been like a member of the family for 14 years, or whatever. Rather than do that, they thought the simple way to enhance passage of this bill with a minimum of fuss was to just grandfather in existing animals. Does that clarify it for you?

SENATOR WESELY: I'm sorry that it is such a good answer because it makes sense, but I truly think that it is unfortunate we are going to allow these animals out there in the future because there has been great harm done, but, yes, I can see what you are saying.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The question is the advancement of the bill. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays to advance the bill, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Do you have anything to read in before we slowly sink into the west?

CLERK: Mr. President, new bills. (Read LB 1116-1121 by title for the first time. See pages 407-9 of the Legislative Journal.)