

discriminated against everywhere else, you're going to be discriminated against here and the state is not going to correct it but you're going to have to buy that insurance and you're going to pay more than white people in west Omaha. Maybe they have more infractions against them than you have against your license but their insurance is going to be cheaper because they're white and they live in west Omaha and that's what the issue is. This is state mandated submission to discrimination. It is the state's policy that is complicitous in this kind of racist impact and action by the insurance companies. They are gouging. It is known that they are gouging. Senator Preister has given you these drawings or these charts that will make it graphically plain. But, has often been the case in this Legislature, racism does not upset anybody to a great enough extent to result in sufficient votes to correct it. Suppose it impacted Catholics and they said, you Catholics, like everybody else, must do this but you're going to be discriminated against, and the state knows it and it's because of the state policy that these companies can discriminate against you, why there would be such an uproar that the thing would be overturned before it even took effect. We are talking about a policy here and the policy is that the state is requiring anybody who is going to have a vehicle on the public streets to buy this insurance. That is a policy determination. That's not based on the Constitution. It's not based on a moral consideration. It's based on a policy adopted by the Legislature. And when that policy results in discrimination, how can the state say it's not going to do anything about it? Then when people, as happened in Wisconsin, go to the federal government and the justice department will have to step in, or as they've had to do with reference to elections in that county out there where Sheriff Storie used to be the county but is no longer the sheriff...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...people get offended and say the government ought to stay out. Well, the government should have no part in discriminating. And I would like to hear Senator Kristensen, who is against the amendment, although he says it's on the basis of germaneness, Senator Coordsen, or anybody else who is opposed to this to just show me how the state does not have dirty hands in this. The state mandates that you purchase this. The state knows that there is discrimination. The state is in a position to rectify that discrimination. The state chooses not to. And I'm glad that we had this on the record because I have had to go