

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

April 11, 2006 LB 1024

you support a nonseverability clause? He said yes. So Senator Chambers is confident that his amendment is constitutional, and what I'm saying is, it's not. And let me just explain exactly what Senator Raikes is trying to do. What will happen with this bill, I would imagine, there would be a lawsuit. I don't believe, frankly, that it's going to be OPS suing. I think, if you're not paying attention, this will be a front-page news story on The New York Times, should we advance this--CNN, whatever. This will make national attention, because for the first time in years, a state has actually sanctioned segregation. That is what we're doing here. What my amendment did, after Senator Chambers' amendment was adopted, has said that if someone sues, and Senator Chambers' amendment is held unconstitutional--and in my opinion it will be--the entire act falls. Because Senator Raikes endorsed Senator Chambers' concept as the solution, it should stand together. And now what Senator Raikes is advocating is that this provision be separated out, and what he's saying is if the Chambers amendment is held unconstitutional, the rest of the bill stands. I believe, personally, that's irresponsible. If he advocated for the amendment, he cannot in good faith add this amendment, saying that if the Chambers amendment falls, that the bill stands. Maybe I'm not making any sense, but what we have...what I adopted with your support was a nonseverability clause. So if the Chambers amendment is found unconstitutional, like I'm convinced it will be, the entire bill falls and we start over. And the reason I did that is because in my conversation with Senator Raikes on Wednesday night, he indicated that the Chambers amendment is part of the solution. And what I'm suggesting to you is if we adopt this amendment, we are being irresponsible, because we are knowingly passing something that's unconstitutional. After that amendment was adopted on Thursday, a lawyer who I respect, who you all will know--I will not name--came to me and said, that was a good piece of lawyering. The amendment that we adopted to make it nonseverable was good lawyering, good policy by the Legislature. I don't understand why Senator Raikes on one hand can get up and say, Senator Chambers' solution is part of the...or Senator Chambers' amendment is part of the solution, and yet now his amendment seems to be saying, well, I recognize it might be unconstitutional, so if it is, I don't want the rest of my bill