

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

April 7, 2003

LB 754

these...this amendment will also improve the bill. It's going to eliminate some surplusage, removing some words that we really don't need, and if these words are taken out, I will not have anything else to say on the bill. Let me read those words again so the record will be clear as to what this amendment says. On page 1, in lines 20 and 21, the following language would be stricken from this bill, quote: "A county that meets the criteria may apply to the director to be designated a livestock friendly county." I don't know why it is necessary to do this. Senator Bromm mentioned that, in addition to this language about the designation of a county as being livestock friendly, there is language which he feels does something that is of value. Since it's his bill and he sees it that way, I'm not going to challenge the way he sees it, but I do take strong issue with this language. There is no way that the state making an affirmative statement about one county or several counties will not be construed as implying something negative about the other counties which do not have that designation. Let's say we were going to talk about senators who are dedicated to doing their job in the way that it ought to be done by a serious, dedicated senator, and the Legislature designates...or somebody outside the Legislature, let's say the court, the court designates Senator Mike Friend, Senator "Quiet" Louden, Senator John "Sand" Synowiecki, Senator Matt Connealy as dedicated senators, period. People know there are 49 senators. What are we saying about the other 45? That they are not dedicated? The court would say, oh, no, no, that's not what I'm saying. The person would ask, why then did you stop with those four? Why did you not include everybody? And if you were including everybody, why name each individual? Couldn't you just say the Legislature is composed of dedicated senators and "senatoresses?" If, on the other hand, those who do not get the designation failed to get it because there is a deficiency or some deficiencies, then it is not necessary to make that declaration by way of explanation. The mere fact that a respected entity separated out four to affirmatively bestow on them an honorific designation means that the other 45, for some reason, are denied that designation because they are not worthy. I don't think the state should do that. Even if some counties can be persuaded to jump through hoops, there is something unseemly and undignified even about that. If you grovel, then you get the designation. If, on the