

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

April 4, 2001

LB 242

to address this, so I would urge the defeat of the Urban...Erdman, excuse me, Senator Erdman, the Erdman amendment and support of AM1076. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Raikes. Senator Erdman.

SENATOR ERDMAN: Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Raikes, I've been called a lot worse other than being mutilated in my last name, so I accept your apology. To be honest with you, I mean, my amendment and its intent, as well written is that I'm not changing the fact that teachers are excluded. They are already excluded. That was done by this institution years before I arrived here. What the Raikes amendment would do would actually hold the consistency of all teachers in the state of Nebraska would be similar in all classes. So in other words, no teachers could serve. What I am asking is saying that if you are an employee, then you would not be eligible to serve. Now as I alluded to earlier in my prior comments, if...if an employee of a state college can't serve in the Legislature, or if there has been other conflicts ruled upon in the past about similar situations, I see a similarity between what we are trying to accomplish by keeping the integrity and the consistency of this body, we're doing the same thing with our local school boards. So once again, if this is not a step that the body is going to take, I accept that. I wanted to make sure that...that we had the discussion on it. I wanted to make sure that the issue was out here to bring light to the fact that there was a discrepancy in the original statute that exempt Class V schools, but I also wanted to bring the idea that if...that if it is an employee as in the teacher, that we shouldn't segregate out teachers only and let other employees, so that there is not a conflict there between the...between the individuals. So that is the intent, is to remove the specific language referring to a teacher to say that it is an employee. Once again, I am not doing anything different as far as relation to the teachers other than bringing in consistency with the rest of the state as far as the teachers goes, and then taking the step to make the question to the body on, are we willing to say that then we should have consistency with other employees since a certain group of employees are excluded. Now I know that the committee had an intention of doing the opposite of what...or some members did, had the