

SENATOR BEUTLER: But, all right, we allow that distinction. So then we get into the area of the mind and we discover that the Americanism law, they are not concerned about that. The Americanism law that requires the teaching of American History and some character things and about American life, that is all right, the state can require them to teach that. Somehow that is not a violation of religious beliefs and now we come down to today and the whole area of curriculum is suddenly not in the area of religious beliefs. That is suddenly all right to compromise that. So all that is left now is teacher certification and how do you distinguish teacher certification from curriculum, from Americanism law, from health and safety, how do you distinguish? And in the area of teacher certification, one final point, Mr. Speaker, let me remind you all that the Reverend Falwell came here at the request of the proponents of this bill and he advocated and he be-railed the people of the State of Nebraska for having teacher certification requirements and for insisting on teacher certification requirements and you know that same Reverend Falwell back in Virginia has applied to the Southern Accreditation Agency, quasi federal agency, and the Southern Accreditation Agency is imposing upon his school in Virginia teacher certification requirements. He has teacher certification requirements in his own school. Well, it is a college, it is not a high school. But if it is a matter of religious belief, I fail to see the distinction between secondary and postsecondary so I think you should roll those things around a little bit also. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Wiitala.

SENATOR WIITALA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, colleagues, before I begin I would like to give a special word of thanks to Senator Nichol who was President of this body before we recessed for noon for allowing this debate to continue and I would like to give special thanks to Senator Hoagland for offering the kill motion, because I knew he did it not so much with the intent of killing the bill as it was to offer some discussion. I feel that very little discussion has occurred on this bill if you consider its immensity. The fact that I was only able to speak once and that was on a sunset motion and that if we had recessed for the noon and passed on this legislation we wouldn't have really had any discussion also at all on the main bill that is before us. I think this is important because I think you need to go back to the Education Committee's intent. LB 652 as it originally was in our committee was probably a bill that a good share of us could have lived with and could have advanced from the committee, but instead