

it all the more necessary to do this because there is this wording in the formal so there would be no way of these people to get together and discuss this unless this is in there.

SPEAKER: Question is shall the Luedtke amendment be adopted? All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say no. Question is shall the Luedtke amendment be adopted. All those in favor will vote aye. Those opposed will vote no. You are voting on the adoption of the Luedtke amendment. Senator Lewis voting aye. Have you all voted? Simple majority is required. Have you all voted now? Clerk will record.

CLERK: 22 ayes, 13 nays, remainder not voting.

SPEAKER: The Luedtke amendment is carried and adopted. Are there other amendments now to L.B. 219.

CLERK: Mr. President, I move to indefinitely postpone L.B. 219. Signed Senator Proud.

SPEAKER: Chair recognizes Senator Proud.

SENATOR PROUD: Well, Mr. President, I was just visiting with a group of high school students from Ralston and one of the questions was, do any of the Senators hold grudges? Well, Senator Chambers tried to kill my resolution, but I don't hold a grudge. This has nothing to do with it but I just point it out so, hoping that Senator Chambers won't be too disturbed at me because he gave me due notice he was going to try to kill that resolution and I, I'm giving him due notice that I don't like this bill. I just finished reading the bill for the first time and I'm not going to be up here very long, I think some other people have something to say about it. I notice for one thing in the bill, Section 2, Subsection 2 on page 219, strike out the words "non-social meetings", which means to me that even social meetings are covered and so if, basically, if a couple of people on a board, any kind of board, a school board or what have you, want to get together over a cup of coffee and discuss some problem, the public's invited and I suppose maybe all that is wonderful but, of course, what it means is that certain extremists which certainly have a right to their opinion, would even try to disrupt a social, what might be basically a social meeting where business could come up and you know, I personally, I don't, I don't really believe that the prohibition against executive sessions where the public is not invited, is a good thing. I believe the public is invited to any general public discussion like we're having here, but when you go into executive session, I don't think it's a good thing for example, for what you might consider extremists, to be at that meeting putting pressure on these members who are trying to discuss intelligently a proposition. It's been my experience that what this actually does is spiteful discussion and it's much harder to get at the truth when you're trying to intelligently make a decision. For example, can you imagine having a meeting of the Supreme Court of the United States after they have heard a case, open to the public? Why, you'd have the darndest bedlam you ever saw. Many of these questions are emotional, but after they have been heard and the public has heard the public discussion, then comes the time to sit down and meditate and make the best decision you can; allowing the public there really doesn't add anything, as a matter of fact, it detracts and I think it results many times in injustice because sometimes the members feel intimidated by a crowd there. There comes a time when you have to be by yourself and think and, and, and discuss and so, these are the reasons basically that I think this type of a bill is going way overboard and if it actually passed, I don't think it would remain on the books very long because I think it would stifle discussion rather than promote it.