

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

February 25, 2003 LB 217

against in employment. And if they went for the job, they were asked, are you a Catholic? And if you said yes, they said no. Senator Hartnett had a personal experience along that line. So what did the Legislature do? At a time when a majority in the body was not made up of Catholics, a majority of the population was not Catholic, but they were persuaded that even though people are not born this way, even though religion is a matter of choice, even though you don't know what a person's religion is unless they tell you...which is all the arguments they give against what I'm trying to do...there is something unseemly and inappropriate about denying a person the right to earn a living because of his or her religion. So in the law was put a requirement that there be no discrimination in employment based on religion. And now some of those very religious people who benefit from that are against expanding that to include other people who are discriminated against. As a black man, how could I, who has suffered discrimination, whose relatives and family members and forebears have been discriminated against, not do everything I can to attack it wherever I find it? Why can't those religious people, who have been shielded against discrimination, reach out to another group being discriminated against now, and help them in the same way that they themselves have been helped? They would not want me to say, I've not discriminated against anybody because of their religion, I have not seen anybody because of their religion discriminated against. But that's what I'm told. Well, I haven't seen anybody discriminated against because of their sexual orientation. You don't know whether you have or not. Because knowing how narrow-minded and intolerant people are in this state, they're not going to tell you. Others say, well, I don't think it's a serious enough problem. As I pointed it out the other day, the President of the United States thought it was a serious enough problem to issue an executive order prohibiting discrimination in all the executive departments and agencies of the executive branch of the United States government. The Nebraska Supreme Court thinks it's serious enough to put a requirement in the canons or the professional ethics that govern judges, saying that they cannot do anything that shows bias or prejudice toward a person based on sexual orientation. So we as legislators, whose job it is to make the law and set a standard for society, are going to say, I haven't seen anybody