

April 5, 1982

LB 652

SENATOR REMMERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, the amendment that I have proposed tightens up the restrictions considerably. There has been some concern about the blind leading the blind and I share that concern.

SENATOR CLARK: (Gavel.) Could we have a little quiet and give him a chance, please.

SENATOR REMMERS: My amendment is addressed to that issue. The rationale for my amendment is that just a few years ago we did have certified teachers in the elementary grades with sixty hours credit and with a hundred twenty hours you could teach in high school and, in fact, right now a degree, a hundred twenty, hundred twenty-five hours will get you certification. It is true that these people probably will not have the same hours that the public school teachers would have but at least they will have training. Now there is no restriction in this amendment as to where this training is received except in a college. It can be their own church college and I know there is some concern that maybe they will not get good training in their colleges but I really don't share that concern. But I am concerned that we do tighten up the rules, that we do require some preparation from these teachers that teach in these Christian schools and again, I base my amendment on the requirements that recently we did have an elementary and still have in the secondary or very similar that. Now there was some concern about those schools being able to have their teachers prepared to that level by next fall and of course that would be impossible for them to do but I did not want them to wait four years and then come up with the same situation we have today. So there are some definite restrictions in this amendment that would require progress each year towards the achieving of this goal of sixty hours for elementary and a hundred twenty for secondary.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator DeCamp. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, this amendment is an attempt to draw a centerist position on some of the issues in 652 and let me tell you that I come from the political left to this language. I am prepared to support LB 652 without this language, without these standards because simply speaking I am prepared to adopt the position that unless the state's interest can be shown to outweigh the first amendment right to religious freedom, I'm going to side with the traditional value of religious freedom. However, there are those of you who do not share that civil libertarian position and because of that we have to arrive at a political majority. Now one need not look far beyond the vote of a last amendment, the kill motion, to see that

10081