

February 11, 1986 LB 772

is it a good bill or is it a bad bill? I certainly don't want to encourage or help paramilitary groups but I also am concerned about taking away rights that a person has, and I am not talking about the right to gather in a group and cause a civil disturbance. I guess it is just the way the bill is drawn that has me confused or perhaps a little bit concerned about what rights will I be giving up, and will I be giving up for the million and a half people in the State of Nebraska if I vote for the bill. So I guess I will just continue to listen to the debate. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers. Senator Hoagland is next.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I have to ask Senator Beutler a question. I asked him once and I got his answer but I think he may not have answered quite the same way because he may have misunderstood Senator Higgins' question or didn't get it the way I did. Senator Beutler, she mentioned that a civil order must be involved or something like that, but the thing I want clearly established again, and I am asking you the question. For one who teaches, and we are still talking about this (1) paragraph at the top, the person teaches, that has been established. Let us say that they knew and intended that the information would be used unlawfully in furtherance of a civil disorder. If no civil disorder ever results from that, is the person who teaches nevertheless guilty of a Class IV felony? Senator Beutler said yes. Senator Wesely, wherever you are, there need be no civil disorder, remember. There has to never be a civil disorder occurring from all of this activity they have been talking about and that is what I think the rest of the body is missing. You keep hearing the term civil disorder and you leap and assume that there must be some kind of civil disorder before a person is guilty of this Class IV felony, but the Class IV felony is in the teaching, not the disorder. There doesn't have to ever be a disorder. And I have to correct something Senator Beutler had said earlier because as he talked, knowing how logical his mind is from past observance of it, he thought that he was stepping into a trap when he thought he trapped me when I said I knew what he knows about the statutes. I said clearly that I base what I know about his knowledge on things he has said in the past. I am talking about the things he has already expressed knowledge of. I am talking about history, not fortunetelling. Now if I attempted to tell you what Senator

8626