

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

April 14, 2005 LB 673

rigidity with rigidity. Who would win if a vote were taken? I can tell you this. The prairie dogs would lose. I cannot call it winning when a majority of policymakers vote to eradicate a group of creatures that nature put here, a group of creatures that was here first and they became problematic and got in the way when these people decided there was a different methodology they would use to make money. To do that, they took other critters from their native habitat and brought them here, not because they would live better, but so that they could be fattened up and killed and provide a source of income. Because the animals already here got in the way of earning that money, the animals already here must die, unless somebody is there to rescue them. And I take it as my job to do everything that I can as a member of this Legislature to frustrate and thwart the desire of those who want to eradicate these prairie dogs. If eradication is not the intent, say so. Calling this bill a management act is the same as calling the Holocaust the final solution. All of those in the know then and all those who understand history now are well aware of those two words' meaning, final solution. Final solution to what? The Jewish problem. What was the Jewish problem? Jews lived in Europe, and the way to solve the problem is to remove them by any means necessary. And what was the means adopted? Extermination, eradication. Eichmann, Hitler, Goebbels, they can call it by any name they choose. When the ultimate outcome is somebody in a gas chamber, then the corpse burned in a crematorium, it doesn't matter how you try to prettify it. So, despite the fact that Senator Loudon doesn't want to call this an eradication bill, that's what it is, and I'm going to fight it to the end. How much time do I have, Mr. President?

SENATOR ENGEL: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. I don't even know whether I will ask Senator Loudon any questions until I get to another definition in this bill which I deem to be inadequate, but in its inadequacy it fits perfectly with the text of the language in the bill. The bill is inadequate. The bill itself is a noxious growth. We've had it told to us that language from the noxious weed bill was put into this proposal, and noxious is a word that applies to more than weeds, and I intend to give you a