

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

May 12, 2005

LB 427

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, no institution in this society, other than the Catholic Church, has faced bankruptcy because of the number of child molestation cases, all committed by Catholic priests, some bishops and some archbishops. Should we say that because it is rampant, spread throughout the church all over the country, not localized, where archbishops, cardinals have participated in transferring these known pedophiles, not inclined but who have committed acts of pedophilia, to other dioceses throughout the country without notifying the parish members that we're saving a ravening wolf among your lambs, should we presume and draw the conclusion that since the Catholic Church is so accommodating to pedophilia that any priest, any deacon, any acolyte, anybody connected with any of the ceremonial activities of the church can be assumed to be a pedophile and it's better to err on the side of safety? Oh, you're a Catholic priest, you're a seminarian, well, maybe you're not the person for this job because the people in your line of work have an established history of pedophilia, endorsement, condonation of pedophilia by the highest ranking officials in the church. Pope Paul II came forth with too little too late and only under intense pressure. Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, now known as Pope Benedict XVI, was trying to hush up grown men who came forth and mentioned that, I forget the name of this place in the Vatican, but they train Americans to be Catholic priests for America, the pedophilia that was going on there and Ratzinger wanted to hush it up. So these men went public because they had been involved and told what had happened. The problem has surfaced in Australia, Scotland, England, wherever Catholic priests, bishops, and archbishops gather, but Senator Foley has never seen me come forth with a bill to say, presume that because somebody is a Catholic priest, he should not be allowed to speak to the Legislature in the morning when they have their ceremonies. Senator Foley is one, based on his religious orientation, and there are others of that orientation, who may not engage in actual discrimination, but orientation is such that it makes them suspect. Senator Landis' language is very discrete, very well crafted to state simply that when it comes to Nebraska as an employer considering a person in any employer-employee relationship, sexual orientation is a nonexistent factor. I'm in support of Senator Landis' amendment, and the term "sexual orientation" is understood by