

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

March 22, 2004 LB 1093

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, I believe deeply in education and the value of education, but I am also troubled by miseducation and, sad to say, that is the way the activities in a lot of the schools can be described. I read a column the other day about a man who had been a Governor and he went to some state and took over or began doing a lot of work with the school system. One of the most important things he saw that needed to be done was to obtain the services of competent teachers, people who knew their subject matter and knew how to teach it. That is what is lacking to a great extent in the public schools today. In the recent past, say a decade ago, maybe two, there was a great emphasis on teaching people how to teach. So they were given all of these courses, they were told how to write lesson plans, how to divide up their time, how to set aside enough time to correct examinations and talk to the students and all these other things, but no emphasis was given to being sure that the person who was to be the teacher understood and had mastered the subject that is to be taught. The one who taught English was not proficient when it came to verbal skills, whether written or oral. Grammar was not something they had a grasp of. And they would have told me don't put that preposition at the end of the sentence, and I would be pleasantly surprised and pleased that they knew that was not to be the case. First of all, they knew that "of" is a preposition and that is not to be at the end of a sentence, but a truly educated person understands that the purpose of spoken words is to be understood. So if putting prepositions at the end of a sentence contributes to understanding and clarity, put the preposition where it's going to serve the best purpose. If splitting an infinitive, as is always done, is going to facilitate clarity of expression, do that too. Sometimes it's good to even use the word, and it is a word, "ain't." Ain't is not a word that has always had a bad connotation. Ain't was a dignified word at one time. Some of the most literary persons used "ain't." You have to allow a contraction for a person who's speaking in the first person. If it's plural, they aren't, he or she isn't. You can't say, because they haven't made it a contraction, I "am't," A-M-apostrophe-T, for "am not." The only thing you have is ain't, I ain't, he/she isn't, they aren't, I ain't. But the