

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

May 12, 2005

LB 427

that if there is in fact some kind of conduct in the workplace that is violative of policies, it would fall without regard to the sexual orientation. If there were affairs of either kind, they would violate policy and they would be punished in a neutral fashion, not on the basis of orientation, but because affairs in the office are wrong. No matter what kind they are, they're all wrong; not half of them, not the other, all of them are wrong. With respect to lawyers suing, you know what, the lawyers that are smart have enough reasons to sue already. You can't stop them and this isn't (laugh)...this is not a gateway to some new set of lawsuits in that if you have a disgruntled employee who's committed to trying to fight their failure, they're...they've already got a standard or basis to do that, and they will be in court and you're not going to avoid it. What happens is it does give remedy for somebody who has in fact, I think, been wronged in this way. With respect to who should or should not be in the locker room in the example that Senator Redfield gave, the answer lies in gender, not orientation. And in any kind of behavior that is inappropriate, any kind of sexual behavior that's inappropriate, it's inappropriate without regard to orientation. It's because a teacher flirts with a child. That is wrong, and it doesn't make any kind of orientation difference. It's not saved because it's straight flirting, and condemnable because it's gay flirting. It's wrong because a teacher flirts with a child. It is not orientation; it's gender and power in those cases. Could we simply read the language? And my own copy got taken away. Here's what I want you to do. If this does not reflect your beliefs, vote against this. If this is a fair characterization of what we should do and how we should behave, vote for it, because this is only about us. We're not doing this for anybody else. This is us as the state government with our employees. This is us as the boss, this is who's speaking, and for nobody else. But as a boss, the state of Nebraska declares that when it is acting as an employer, not as an independent contractor but only as employer...foster care parents are not employees. It doesn't cover the foster care parents. They're not employees; they're independent contractors. For our employees, sexual orientation is irrelevant in personnel matters and shall not be a criteria in determining just cause for hiring, firing, promotion, demotion, and other personnel matters covered by its