

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

April 13, 2006 LB 239

of, as Senator Erdman has wisely recognized, to change anybody's mind, but that the record be a little clearer, and I didn't feel it was the other day. One of you, as our colleague, said the other day that it came down to one word, illegal. All of us have received an e-mail that says, what is it about illegal that you don't understand? Well, that's the right question because I don't understand how that word is being used, especially as a noun applied to some person. How can we use it that way for one group of people and not use it for somebody else? If a drunk driver comes down the street twice over the limit and permanently paralyzes one of your family members, we don't call that person an illegal. That person can go to court and all the rest of it and be condemned, but we don't call that person an illegal. Yet that person has done a terrible harm to our society. That person has piled up expenses on us as a state that won't stop. Our son's bill is \$2 million. That person has done something intentionally which is hurtful to all of us, but that person is still not an illegal. So, I'm not pleading for special sympathy for a group of persons. That's not where I'm at. I'm saying, we are unclear in our language and, therefore, unclear in our thinking because this kid is not breaking the law, and to our knowledge, has never broken the law. Their parents did. We have it on word from the feds that that person is not now breaking the law nor are her parents breaking the law by living here. They've not been charged; they've not been taken to court; they've not been judged guilty. They are our kids. And we have also from the federal government the word that we can provide benefits to these persons as long as they are not better benefits than the rest of our citizens in the state are receiving, so we're meeting that test. I simply would recognize that I'm not feeling to be threatening or challenging a law. Senator Erdman is quite correct. This is in somebody else's hands, and I am upset about their unwillingness to deal with it. But, at the same time, our kids are going to become our adults. So I'm not trying to be nice to them. I'm trying to be nice to us. Are we going to set up a section of our society that is on second-class work status because we--we didn't prevent them; we didn't prohibit them; many of them are going out-of-state and getting an education and coming back--but that we put a barrier in their way? I would hope we would not do that. Thank you.