

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

March 10, 2004 LB 1005

others. It's just continuing something that's already in existence. And I don't have any clue as to whether any other disability groups have ever tried to become part of the same program or not. But to date, at least, there hasn't been anything established for other groups. And I don't know if I'm contributing anything to this discussion or not, because like I said, I didn't hear all of it. But I would give you the rest of my time, Senator Chambers, to continue your discussion, if you would wish. Senator Cudaback.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I'd like to give my time to Senator Chambers, if I might.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers, you have...about two minutes have elapsed, so you have about three minutes left.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Schimek. I'm not saying that the bill didn't have a hearing, because Senator Foley pointed it out, and that it came out unanimously. I'm just saying that it's coming before us as an amendment and not as a bill. Had it been here as a bill, there would have been a greater opportunity to discuss it. I don't want to hold up the underlying bill. I have questions about what is being done, but I will not hold up the adoption of the amendment. But I'm not comfortable doing this. If one group has been advocated for, and the state is going to do what it can to assist that group, I don't have an objection. But this is cutting out an area where work can be done from which revenue or income can be derived. No other similarly situated group would have the opportunity. Now, if we were dealing with a group, as I do when I talk about those who are discriminated against because of sexual orientation, it's a different set of circumstances, because there are policies directed at those groups to harm them. There are not policies directed at the blind to harm them. But because of their handicap, there are certain things that are not available for them to do, based on their handicap, not a status. So I don't see anything inappropriate with the state reaching out to assist. But if there are similarly situated people who cannot...