will have the same frustrations in regard to the total postsecondary educational system that many of us have had for a long time. So that will be my reason for opposing adding Kearney State to this bill. It's not because I believe Kearney State should not be a part of the university. I think, in all probability, it should, but I do not believe this is the right vehicle. I believe that it will short-change the study if we do not leave that situation in regard to Kearney's status quo so that we will have an effective, an objective look at the whole postsecondary educational system in this state. And by taking the pressure off with the Kearney State proposal, I don't believe anything will be done.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. An amendment on the desk, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Scofield would move to amend Senator Withem's amendment. (The Scofield amendment appears on page 1565 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Scofield, please.

SENATOR SCOFIELD: Thank you, Mr. President, and members, I have taken Senator Withem's amendment and will be using this as a way I think to address not only my concerns but concerns that have already been raised by Senator Wesely and Senator Lamb. And I feel that I should apologize, frankly, to Senator Withem for not having brought him an amendment sooner and I guess just because I have been so occupied with the budget that I don't yet have language that I really like in terms of focusing a study. But I do not accept the amendment in its current form and I think this is a real good opportunity though for us to talk about what is it exactly do we want to know about higher education in this state that we can't learn in that orange crate of studies and where do we want to end up at? And I have heard a lot of comments here lately that I think, frankly, I would almost interpret as negative towards higher education. I sense some frustration and that concerns me greatly and I don't want us to move in that direction. I agree wholeheartedly with Senator Withem's intent. I thought his first bill was...I agree with him, it was probably too broad but I liked much better the direction that the original green copy headed us in in terms of starting us at a proper point. It concerns me in the layout of the current amendment that I think we're going to get off on the wrong foot and probably not end up any more satisfied with where