

private employees, a lot of them are three, six months, a year, whatever. The Legislature, we have four years before we have to go back, not five. So my question is, and I do hope that everyone will support the Chair and vote not to overrule the Chair, and get rid of this amendment, my question is, why are we punishing teachers with a five-year probation period? That seems...I don't know what happened here, that seems punitive to me. So I am for the Chair, I am against this amendment, and I hope that we will get rid of it very quickly now and vote to support the Chair. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Smith, on the germaneness. Senator Hefner, on the germaneness.

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President and members of the body, first of all, let me clear up one thing. It has right in our statute books before the start of 79-12,107, it has tenure, tenure in big letters. So, Senator Lynch, did you see this? So it does say, tenure. Maybe probationary period would be a better word for it but it says tenure right in our statute books. So I think we need to talk about it. The amendment that we just adopted, Mr. President, dealt with the same sections, and there is another amendment coming up with the CIR, so I would say that all of these should go together, CIR, salary increases, tenure or probationary period, whatever you want to talk about, and some other things. So I would say that this amendment is germane and, Senator Crosby, we are not punishing the teachers. I think it is only fair to have a probationary period. In many businesses, you don't have that probationary period, and what we are trying to do is make it fair for those teachers that have been with that system a long time, and so I would urge you to support me in challenging the Chair and overruling the Chair.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Moore, did you wish to speak on germaneness?

SENATOR MOORE: Mr. President and members, even though Senator Hefner's vote and mine will probably be the same, when we actually move to advance the bill on this issue, we are going to differ. As Senator Withem very accurately stated the other day, we, as a body, on a motion of Senator Wehrbein trying to amend Senator Chizek's bill, set a precedent of a very narrow germaneness ruling, and that quite simply, if what is good for the goose is good for the gander, which, you know, if we want to be consistent, we have to support the Chair here again today