

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

February 18, 2003 LB 52

SENATOR CUDABACK: The house is under call. All unauthorized personnel please leave the floor. Unexcused senators report to the Chamber. The house is under call. Unauthorized personnel please leave the floor, please. The house is under call. Senator Mossey, Senator Byars, Senator Friend, Senators Burling, Landis, Price, Quandahl, Raikes, and Thompson, please report to the Chamber. Senator Raikes. Senator Price, Senator Mossey. Been a request for a roll call vote. Senator Raikes is not here. Did you wish to go ahead? All present or accounted for, Senator Chambers has authorized a roll call vote on FA1163. Mr. Clerk, call the roll. Reverse order has been requested, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: (Roll call vote taken, Legislative Journal page 557.)
21 ayes, 2 nays, Mr. President, on the amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: The motion to adopt the Chambers amendment was not successful. I do raise the call. Senator Landis, on the bill itself...I mean on FA1161 to LB 52.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I support the general policy objective that Senator Chambers is trying to achieve here, but it would be odd to have my vote up here and not have it on the record as to why it will be in the no category for the adoption of this amendment. The last amendment was to put this amendment in proper form, which I think was an appropriate thing to do, and I voted for it. This is a policy objective I support, but what it does is amends Senator Pederson's underlying bill, which is the giving of certain powers to certain communities for certain effects, and then this amendment says, but you only get this power from the Legislature in the event you've adopted a local ordinance that protects citizens from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. The right approach to this objective is to pass a state statute; it's to get it out of one of our committees; it's to vote on it straight up; it's not to apply it as a rider to a bill of another kind. And even though I support this objective, what I don't want to begin is this notion of this rider that says, cities, you only get these powers in the event you do this kind of an ordinance that we want you to have when, in fact, we can't get that kind of a state statute out of our Judiciary