

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

February 18, 2003 LB 52

bill, and I would ask for your support. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Pederson. You've heard the opening on LB 52. (Visitors introduced.) Mr. Clerk, an amendment.

CLERK: Senator Chambers would move to amend, FA1161. (Legislative Journal page 556.)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers to open on FA1161 to LB 52.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this is an amendment similar to the one that I offered the other day. It relates to prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation. LB 52 is not a bill whose contents I have any problem with. So I want Senator Pederson and those who support his bill to know that my amendment in no way will hinder what they're trying to do. And what is it that I'm trying to do, you might wonder. I am trying to bring Nebraska in line with a policy that is humane, just, and civilized. I had offered this amendment on another bill last week. Senator Schimek asked me had a vote been taken in the Business and Labor Committee on my bill, which was drafted to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation, discrimination in employment. At that time, no vote had been taken. A vote was taken this morning, and the bill did not advance because, out of the seven members on the committee, four voted against advancing the bill. Two righteous men voted to advance the bill. One individual, whom Dante said will have a place in the hottest part of Hades, one of those whom Jesus said, I want you to be hot or cold, if you're lukewarm I'll spew you out of my mouth, one of those did not vote. People in a legislative setting, whether on the floor or in the committee, may do as they please, and need not even give an explanation. There's nothing in the constitution that compels a member to ever open his or her mouth once that oath has been taken, as far as I know. There is no statute that requires a senator to participate in debate or explain a vote. We certainly have no rules that require such. So what we do as men and women of the world, as practical politicians, is to draw inferences, make deductions, arrive at conclusions based on the circumstantial evidence we have, and go