

ment is because of the precedent. A year ago within the deficiency bill the Appropriations Committee recommended to you and it was adopted by the entire Legislature that there would be some reimbursement but it was to be paid out of Game Commission cash funds which essentially was fees collected for hunting, and in this specific case, for hunting of deer. As I understand it, the Game Commission declined or for whatever reason at least did not make those reimbursements but rather took the position that those reimbursements ought to be processed through the Claims Board and subsequently the Claims Committee of the Legislature and then paid for by general fund money. It seems to me that while it is a modest beginning that this is one of those precedents that might be established this session that could have significant financial impact over a period of time and I am not sure where it might end up at and I suppose you can make a logical argument that rabbits eat lettuce in gardens and there ought to be reimbursement for wildlife there. Rabbits are hunted by some and so forth and I am not attempting to make that kind of argument at all because I don't choose to do that but I do think that to start using general fund money to reimburse losses for wildlife damage creates a precedent that has no limits as to where it could eventually reach, and like so many of these kinds of programs when they first begin, they start modest, there seems to be rationale for them, but over a period of time adding a little here and a little there, each individual step having some logic to it, eventually you reach a point where substantial funds are being utilized for a purpose that probably is questionable when you get all done, at least questionable logic or justification for it. And I can speak somewhat personally because we...well, I will not do that. I did that once on a bill and then...many years ago so I will drop that. But it seems to me as a pure matter of precedent that the only logical thing to do is not to reimburse because of the conceivable and probable end result over a period of time where we could be making substantial general fund appropriations for losses caused by the various wildlife throughout the state and I would hope that it would be understood this is not a strong personal feeling at all as far as whether or not the individual should be reimbursed for the hay that was eaten by deer because I can appreciate and understand those individuals' point of view but I think the precedent that is established here is of considerable significance and I would hope that the body would see fit not to establish that precedent by adopting the amendment and striking from the bill those reimbursements requested