

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

March 3, 2003

LB 54

orientation being brought into the question when we have a definition. So my inclusion of language relative to sexual orientation would not approve of marriage between people of the same sex. It would be language to the effect that sexual orientation shall not be a consideration, without taking away the requirement that the relationship be based on marriage or blood. I don't want to have a situation where there's a marriage and people determine or discover that one of the partners is homosexual and, for that reason, there is determined to be a lack of suitability to take advantage of this bill. So the question that I put to you is this. How would language, explicitly declaring that sexual orientation cannot be considered when we're talking about the definition of "relative" and we leave everything else in the definition as it is, how could that pose a problem based on the thinking you've been able to give on short notice to this question?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And I'm looking at the Raikes amendment, by the way.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Erdman.

SENATOR ERDMAN: Senator Chambers, I guess the...I'm not going to answer your question with a question, but I would say that currently the practice doesn't show there is a discrimination against those individuals. The example that you gave for two homosexuals who are married, for whatever reason, whether it be to protect them from whatever scrutiny or whatever that you claimed on your comment, the limiting factor is that they are actually married, regardless of what they proclaim their sexual orientation to be, and that doesn't matter if they're two homosexuals, who say they're homosexuals, are married to each other or what other, other arrangement. The limitation is that they're married legally, so that qualifies them. There's nothing that would prohibit them. The other side of that is, is that, again, if they are a relative, if I...and this is the case. There was a...there are situations in the state of Nebraska where the department has said it's in the best interests of this child to be with this individual. That