

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

May 22, 2003

LB 270

SENATOR FOLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the question doesn't relate to the bill, I think I'd prefer just to not respond. Thank you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. And I didn't want to blindside him, but there are members on the Judiciary Committee who were talked to by Senator Foley about Senator Aguilar's bill with the drug court, and he was opposed to the provision that said there could be no discrimination based on sexual orientation. Now the committee members know that and you all have heard him rail on other bills, so he needs to understand what the word lie and liar means. His conduct and his attitude has shown clearly what he is about, and I'm going to challenge him on it. And if the body wants us to come to a halt on Senator Brashear's bill, I don't care. And if he is opposed to Senator Brashear's amendment to put some vindication of victims' rights into the statute, I don't care. That is another area which I had opposed doing. I had opposed putting that in the constitution. I had opposed efforts to pass laws of the kind senators...Senator Brashear's amendment would create, but once again, Senator Brashear had talked to me, presented arguments and persuaded me. My mind can be changed on issues and when my mind is changed I see no value in holding to a position which is in error. With Senator Aguilar's bill, I explained to him what was happening, that the bill had no chance to get out of committee as long as the provision about sexual orientation was connected to his bill. He said he would support adding that amendment once the bill got to the floor. I know whereof I speak, and I will not hush up just because those people behind the glass, these Family "Last" people and all these others, are upset with what I say, or because Senator Foley is upset. I've shown consideration to Senator Foley. When we were talking about some bill that dealt with what they call dark fiber, utilization of that and renting it to others, he works for some company and he thought if he offered a certain amendment it would be a conflict of interest. He asked me would I offer the amendment and I said, sure, the amendment has validity, I'll offer it. He knows that, but he won't bring it up. So the fact that he is a "one-ideaed" individual has not made me discount everything he has said, if what he has said has some validity. But when it comes to this issue, everybody on this floor knows what's at stake, but I'm