

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

January 21, 2000 LB 182

that's...those are questions that certainly need to be answered. I do support this part of the amendment, striking Section 5. I was going to ask why we needed that section, when the law is the law with respect to teacher dismissal and that kind of thing. And so I appreciate Senator Beutler bringing this amendment. One question that I'm going to ponder with a little bit, and this...it's interesting how you can get just a couple of pages of a bill and still...and you think the first time you read it that you understand it all, and then when you start rereading it and you listen to arguments, you got to have some questions. And one of the questions I have, Senator Beutler, if you would yield.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Absolutely.

SENATOR BROMM: And it goes back to, I think, what Senator Redfield was driving at, and I tried to listen to your answer as well. But in the first section, in Section 1...Section 2, the last sentence: The Legislature further finds that school boards within the state that adopt the publications code ought to adopt such that are consistent with the maximum appropriate freedom of expression for students, as described in this act, I'm paraphrasing that a little bit. But what I am struggling with a little bit is...and you said you'd go along with striking that out, perhaps. Maybe that is intent language. But when you say "ought to adopt such that are consistent with the maximum appropriate freedom of expression", that's going to be argued, at some point in litigation, what that means. What is the maximum appropriate freedom of expression, as you see it, as the author of this...of this piece of legislation? Is that...is that set forth in Section 4, or what is that?

SENATOR BEUTLER: No, I think, Senator, it is what I think we so often do in findings, and perhaps we...perhaps we shouldn't do it, you know. Often times we pay very little attention to findings, and other times we pay a lot of attention to them. But as you and I know, unless there is a problem with the clear language of the bill, the finding is not going to have any effect on interpretation than an operative provision, anyway. You're right, first of all, that it's not important to the bill, as far as I'm concerned. If it's troublesome to some, to Senator Redfield and others, I would certainly be willing to