

have a discreet methodology included with this provision that would tell what is to become of it. It wouldn't be enough merely to have general statements made. We are talking about a fundamental right which is essential to the operation in a peaceable manner of an ordered society. So if perchance a rule or regulation is going to have an impact on the right peaceably to assemble, the agency which is going to enact or adopt that rule or regulation should be required to provide in narrative form a description and explanation of what that impact will be. Since the right to assemble is one that goes to the rights of the public, the analysis performed by the agency will not have value, the narrative being required would not have value unless this is made available to the public. In keeping with my idea of being opposed to this bill as it's written, of not putting an undue hardship and burden on these agencies, the provision that I'm offering also says that the public can inspect this narrative, they can copy it but only during regular business hours. All of these things are necessary. Whether people like the amendment or not, on the chance it may be adopted, I want it to be in appropriate form. And I don't know of anybody who could stand and say they're opposed to having consideration given to whether or not the right peaceably to assemble is going to be impacted by a proposed rule or regulation. I don't know of anybody who could say that once that analysis that this amendment would require of such an impact is completed there should not be a narrative dealing with the results of that analysis, nor am I aware of anybody who would say that narrative should not be available for public scrutiny and copying. So this that I'm offering is serious. I think in its import it is more serious than LB 168 as currently drafted. It was brought to Senator Jones and Senator Jones does not understand the full impact of it. Senator Bromm, in his discussion, indicated that there are a few holes in his knowledge and understanding of how property law has developed and the development of court cases. But all of those are matters to be worked out during debate. Often, when we deal with a subject which is broad, which has many aspects and more than two sides in approaching it, some statements are going to be made which are not factual. Those statements should be corrected during the discussion. When statements are made which are factual but are designed to uphold an approach which is not wise, it's for those of us who disagree with that approach to offer our arguments and give reasons as to why we think that should not be the case. I believe that the actions of agencies and departments of government should be matters of public knowledge, unless there is some compelling