

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

April 13, 2004      LB 625

information on just what's going on, then you're going to pass a law that says, do what HUD said you can't do, and HUD is going to give you a year to correct it? The federal government has withheld funds from states for various reasons, and they have not always given a year, and especially when you can show bad faith. That's something you all are familiar with from the low-level nuclear waste case and how that was handled by the state. The state has been given a clear warning by HUD that what the Attorney General told them goes against what HUD allows. That is there. Now having been given that warning, you're going to disregard it, and you're going to say, well, you acted innocently, that you had no idea that HUD was going to take seriously your passing a law that does what you were warned against doing in a letter from HUD. I have got to lay on those issues, so that the record is crystal-clear. And I will help HUD withhold money, to show the state that we should not toy with these federal agencies, and especially when we're dealing with something as critical as housing, shelter that people need. Senator Bourne thinks it might be sufficient to show the problem with the money being at risk. I have to go deeper and talk about the work that is done by these testers, and the kind of practices they're trying to break up. Under the current law, if there's an accusation, the respondent, which could be the company, gets notice identifying the housing...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...practice that is condemned, a copy of the original complaint. Well what more do they need? Your agent listed a house as being for sale, a minority person came and wanted to buy, and the agent said it's not for sale; a white person came, and the agent said it is for sale. What kind of...what more do you need than that, if you're not trying to placate an alibi for those who discriminate? If a Coca-Cola salesperson commits an act of discrimination in one of the other plants, Coca-Cola is responsible, the parent company. That's why Coca-Cola pays off large judgments. Nobody ever says that the CEO did this, or said it could be done. It was done by the company, and by people in the course...scope of their duty, and Coca-Cola the corporation is liable.