

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

April 14, 2005      LB 673

this. Then, if Senator Louden at a future date wants to put a definition into the law, he can do so. As it stands now, he has a definition which, as I read it, is inadequate. Would it nullify the bill? No. The body of the bill tells what things are to be done, what the triggering events are, who has the responsibility and authority to get this entire scheme rolling. It starts with the county board. So, despite the fact that the term "colony" is used, the only time it would result in ambiguity, if we find the term "colony" used in the body of the bill. And why would that cause ambiguity? Because sometimes the language talks about managing prairie dogs. Then it talks about managing colonies. So the two must be different, otherwise the same word would be used throughout. So when you use more than one word, it's expected that you're talking about more than one thing. So get rid of colonies and talk about the animals. Senator Louden could even use some intent language and say the intent of the Legislature is to have this bill mean what a court says it means when a court understands what we mean but we didn't succeed in saying it. That's what he should put. What else I think he ought to put in it is that it is not the intent of the Legislature that this bill be interpreted as an eradication bill, but that won't be put in. Senator Louden is as rock solid against that as I am against the bill. If I am unreasonable in my opposition to the bill, he is just as unreasonable in his opposition to declaring that eradication is not an option. So you have us at an impasse. There is nobody who can mediate between us; nobody who can bring us to what somebody might call a compromise. Abraham Lincoln said words to the effect that a man should never interpose his head between the skillet in the hand of an angry wife, and the head of her husband at whom she is angry. Because, see, when a skillet is in an angry hand, it's going to just go the most direct line to the target, and if your head gets in that line, your head has got to go when the skillet comes, too. And some people, namely me, think that when George Bush wound up with that big old bruise upside his head, it didn't come from him choking on a pretzel and falling on the rug. It came from a well-placed skillet in the hands of a woman with deadly aim who was very irritated and annoyed at him. So he got a "Crawford caress," and that's what they call it when you pop somebody upside the head with a skillet in Crawford, Texas. I don't know why