

the provisions of that act will make available funds to improve the performance of these students then the waiver will be granted, in my humble opinion. If you look at page 2 of these questions, question 3 says, "Will SEAs and LEAs have a period of time to comply with the requirements of the Gun-Free Schools Act?" Then they go ahead and talk about how you had better go ahead and get this thing done quickly, and here's the final sentence in question 3, the answer. States that have not enacted and made effective legislation by this date risk losing these funds. If you go down to question 5, the answer says, in the first sentence, failure to comply with the requirements of the Gun-Free Schools Act could result in the withholding of these funds. So they equivocate throughout. You may lose funds. You run the risk of losing funds. You could lose the funds. I think the whole act is poppycock and it is ridiculous. After saying that every student found to have brought one of these guns, transmitted one of these guns, or used one of these guns shall be expelled for a year, it says that the policy adopted must allow whoever the chief executive officer is to modify the expulsion on a case-by-case basis. So, on the one hand, they are going to be saying you've got to expel them, you've got to for a year, but then at the same time they say that policy must contain a provision allowing that expulsion to be modified. But then they say can that case-by-case basis requirement be used to avoid general compliance, and the answer is no. Well, how do they know whether it is being used to avoid it. This is strictly a political act by a bunch of people who put their irons in the fire in Washington and lost out on what they were trying to do. So now to save face, they are going to bully and buffalo whichever states they can into doing the same nonsensical, poorly thought-out think that Congress cannot do. I am opposed to this motion. But if you do suspend the rules, and if you do strip the contents from LB 658, and you do insert this poppycock, you've got some changes to make in it. I will show you. I don't even like it. On page 3 of Senator Bohlke's amendment, in line 12, it says, "The policy may authorize the superintendent or school board to modify the expulsion requirement on an individual basis." The requirement says that you shall include that in your policy, not may. That word has to be changed from may to shall, and I have an amendment up there to do it. These bad bills I don't like, but I like to mess with them and show that I read something I don't like better than those who like it. But, again, I can understand people scrambling because they flee when no one pursues. When they hear a leaf...