

copy, you will see that again I have tracked the language that exists in the bill now. You make it a crime for people to assemble with one or more person for the purpose of training with, practicing with, or being instructed in the use of these items that I listed. All I have done is added that it is equally wrong to assemble for the purpose of writing down the things that relate to these items when the intent is that such writing deal with information designed to be used in a civil disorder. Now, are the libertarians of the Nebraska Legislature going to vote down this reasonable amendment while supporting the bill which makes it a crime to assemble under the circumstances outlined in the bill? That is the amendment. That is what I am offering and I hope that you will support it.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President, members, Senator Chambers and I have two different approaches to this particular bill. Senator Chambers' approach is to make a bad bill worse and clearly illustrate its flaws. My approach with an amendment I have up, there is to make a bad bill slightly better and I am not saying that he is right and I am wrong or vice versa because I sure don't know. I do believe that the bill itself is a classic example of what occurs in most political campaigns, if you will think about it. I will use a real good example, the current gubernatorial campaign. The reason I bring this up is because of statements by Senator Hoagland about a concept. There is no disagreement by anybody in the body about the concept of being against terrorism, about the concept of being anxious and willing to stop one individual from hurting or injuring another individual in civil disturbances. But then you get to the actual mechanics of the act and that is where some of the problems come. When you listen to candidates, be it John DeCamp, or Vard Johnson, or Ernie Chambers, not Ernie Chambers, Kay Orr, whoever, they will say, we are for decreased spending and a hold on taxes, or we are against too permissive a society and then you say, and A, B, C, D, E, cut this, cut that, well, we are against that one. That is not...I guess what we are saying is we are for the concept of restraining civil disorder but maybe the particular application or techniques here go far beyond what you think. And anytime we are thinking only of the concept, we have a tendency not to deal with the specifics. So I would like to use a specific example to try to illustrate my