

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

January 29, 2004 LB 172

coerced by circumstances. Something, again, is better than nothing. But I have to offer something that I think would be an improvement on what Senator Schimek has before us, and I would ask her to listen. In line 12, after "materials" I would put a sentence that any such personal inquiry shall be confidential. It would be of no value whatsoever to have a place for a student to go to make an inquiry if before the student returned to homeroom, a class, or wherever the student was going to go, everybody throughout the school knew about it. I would put that sentence, and I would not add anything about, if the confidence is broken the employee should be terminated. I would want a violation of this confidence handled in the way that any violation of confidential material in the public schools is handled. I'm not trying to complicate the existing law or create new law with reference to how a violation of confidence is to be handled. But schools are like beauty shops, barber shops, and army barracks... "barrackses." Gossip runs rampant. And if it weren't for the fact that an ocean separates the United States from other parts of the world, by way of gossip, information would get from the United States there quicker than any other means--telegraph, Internet, telephone, doesn't matter. In schools, there would be gossip. The employee should not be a person dedicated solely to giving this kind of information, because visiting that office would automatically let everybody know what the student is coming there for. So there may be ways, despite this sentence that I'm offering, even if it's adopted, that others could find out or figure out what a person is going to that employee for. If the employee is desperate enough, some risks are assumed. But I don't want the employee to be the source of information about the inquiry that the young person has made. So I would like to ask Senator Schimek a question.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Schimek, will you respond?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, I would.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Schimek, would you consider this amendment to be reasonable?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I think so, Senator Chambers. I'm wanting to