

so we congratulate you and remind you that the first 42nd (sic) years are the hardest. Thank you for the cinnamon rolls. We have...we have several lights on. Senator Warner, on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President and members of the Legislature, I certainly appreciate the point that Senator Chambers has made with the amendment, however, I would...be my thought that inasmuch as the parent bill, LB 21, was indefinitely postponed, and an effort to raise it on the floor was not successful that it probably had ought not to be attached to this bill as well. But I certainly understand the issue that he is pointing out but I believe I will be voting no on the amendment in order not to have that issue put into this bill which probably would add controversy.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Hall, on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President, and members, Senator Chambers has the ability to deal with bills in a couple different ways. One of them is he badgers them to death, and he will throw up amendments that pick the bill apart, look at the weak spots and basically wears down the bill, his opposition and the clock in many cases. The other way he has to deal with it is how he likes to deal with my bills. He loves them to death. He puts up amendments that I can't help but support, knowing full well that they more than likely doom the bill, and since we're on a time frame here I can...and I know we're not going to meet it and that's fine because we would have to adopt the committee amendments and then deal with the advancement of the bill and I know there's others who still have questions about the underlying bill, we might as well talk about LB 21 a little bit, the sexual orientation issue. As you know, I introduced a bill a few years back and brought it back again and it was a different bill other than the one that Senator Chambers offers his amendment in number, but in substance they're similar if not identical. The rationale behind it makes a lot of sense, I mean, there's no reason in the world that anyone should be discriminated against for purposes of employment and that's what the underlying amendment does. It says that you don't discriminate against anyone, whether they be a heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, whatever their sexual orientation is, you just look at people in terms of their work product and their ability to get the job done, if you will. That happens in many