

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

May 22, 2003

LB 270

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Chambers. (Visitors introduced.) Senator Foley.

SENATOR FOLEY: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Just to put on the record that Senator Beutler did indeed yield me some time. I accepted that time. I assumed he was simply extending a courtesy to me. He and I have never discussed this bill. I don't have a clue what Senator Beutler's current views are on this bill. If his views have changed, that's fine. I have no quarrel with that. I did not receive the time from Senator Beutler as any kind of an indication that he was in support of my views on this bill. His views are his own, and he's welcome to state them any way he cares to state them, either here on the floor or in any other venue, so I just want to put that on the record. Also, on this hate crimes...or, excuse me, the drug court bill, and I'm going to try to do this from memory and I'm going to state right up front I might be wrong about this, but let me just try from memory to state what I think the scenario was on the drug court bill. If I'm not mistaken, Senator Aguilar brought a drug court bill last session. It may have been his priority bill, I'm not certain about that, but anyway, the bill did get to the floor, and Senator Chambers didn't care for the bill, and he used some of the tactics that I use occasionally and he did everything he could to fight the drug court bill. The bill never made it to the Governor's desk. This session Senator Aguilar came back with another drug court bill, and here's where my memory gets fuzzy. I think that the green copy of Senator Aguilar's drug court bill this session did not include the phrase "sexual orientation." I think that's true. Now, the bill was heard in the Judiciary Committee. We then went to an Executive Session to consider whether or not to report out that bill. At that time there was a committee amendment drafted that did include the term "sexual orientation." I raised questions about that, saying why would we insert this phrase when there had been no discussion of it in the committee process, there was no witness that indicated there was a particular problem in that area, there wasn't a word said about it in the committee hearing. And again, I'm going from memory, so if I'm wrong, I'm wrong, but I'm doing the best I can from memory. There wasn't a word said about that in the