

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

May 12, 2005

LB 427

his hypothetical, a single person. Now we know that inappropriate conduct on the job can get anybody fired with no regard given to sexual orientation or anything else. You agree?

SENATOR JENSEN: Yes, I agree.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Are you aware that the law right now prohibits employment discrimination based on marital status?

SENATOR JENSEN: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That would also mean...that would mean whether you chose to be married or not married, wouldn't it?

SENATOR JENSEN: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. When we talk about sexual orientation, do you think the courts, after all these years and the litigation that has occurred, will have an understanding of what that term means if a case is presented to it?

SENATOR JENSEN: I do, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So do I, and I knew you did. Now, here's what I'm going to ask you, dealing specifically with Senator Landis' amendment. Should sexual orientation be a criterion considered by the state when it comes to employer-employee relations?

SENATOR JENSEN: I don't know why it has to be there.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, that's not what I'm asking you.

SENATOR JENSEN: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Should it be a criterion?

SENATOR JENSEN: Should it be a criteria?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.