

April 7, 1989

LB 247

vote aye, opposed nay. Have you all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

ASSISTANT CLERK: 27 ayes, 5 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Debate has ceased. Senator Withem, do you wish to close?

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, I do, Mr. President, members of the body. I'm going to suggest some procedural sort of things that we go through here, because I think we're getting, we're getting confused as you tend to get confused when you start mixing issues. I'm not critical of anybody for mixing issues here, because they are inseparable. What I'm going to suggest we do is that you adopt the Withem amendment. I think the Withem amendment, if for no other reason, I guess I'd plead to the members of the body it's my amendment to my priority bill, it gets the bill into the type of shape that I would like to see it. The next thing I'm going to offer, now listen closely because you may not understand this, I'm not sure I understand this. The next thing I'm going to offer is an amendment to the bill, after you adopt the Withem amendment, that will strike any reference to Kearney at all. I'm going to offer that. I'm going to vote against it, Senator Langford, don't worry, I'm going to vote against it and urge people to vote against it, but I think the issue of Kearney is getting...coloring people's views on the issue of the study. So I think we deserve an up or down vote at this point on whether there even ought to be a reference to Kearney in the bill. Senator Wesely, for instance, said he read the amendment, and I'm pleased that he read it. The next thing I'd like for him to do is understand it maybe. That's a two-step process there. Phase one of the bill is not a study on Kearney State. Phase one of the amendment is a study on governance, it's a study on whether we ought to be governed by a single board over all of higher education, whether we ought to continue a...three different groups, three different systems of governing higher education, and whether, if we're going to continue that, whether we'd ought to transfer one piece of that puzzle, Kearney, into another. But I think the specific reference to Kearney in the bill is coloring our feelings on it, so I think we deserve an up or a down vote on the Kearney issue. And I'm going to be offering you the opportunity to take that up or down vote, and I'm going to urge you to vote against my amendment. But, at this point, procedurally, I think we need to