

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

February 18, 2003 LB 52

prohibited discrimination in employment based on sexual orientation, and their states are the better for it; their society is the better for it. There is a gentling down of society every time a group which had been locked out is invited in. There is a broadening of the tolerance that society has. Some people are put in such dire straits that they would consider it a blessing to simply be left alone, allowed to live and let live. That is the maximum that I'm trying to accomplish. Some people say you cannot get rid of homophobia through legislation. That's why I have not offered a bill saying homophobia is against the law. I am concerned about conduct and we do legislate against conduct. To those who say that sexual orientation is a matter of choice, I don't believe it, but let's say they do. Religion is a matter of choice, but we have a provision in the law prohibiting discrimination in employment based on religion. And there are some nutty people with some nutty beliefs, based on my opinion, who fly in under that overarching banner of religion and cannot be discriminated against. But when it comes to people, whose sexual orientation we disagree with or disapprove of, trying to get a job, we suddenly want to slam the door in their face and say you should not be entitled to work. If you manage to get a job, they should be able to take that job from you based solely on your sexual orientation, not misconduct, not inability to do the job, not lack of qualification. You should be in a position where they can take your job and your livelihood and the law does not protect you. What kind of country is this? That's why, when I was parsing...

SPEAKER BROMM: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...that executive order and got sidetracked by the U.S. Constitution and some words in the Preamble, we the people of the United States, who is included in that word "we?" By adding those following words, the people of the United States, it does not say citizens. It says people. So does that mean every thing born of a man and a woman is included in the term "people?" If so, would every thing born of a man and a woman in this country be included in that "we" that is the first word in the Preamble to the U.S. Constitution? If they are included, if all people in this country are included...