

CLERK: Mr. President, I now have a series of amendments. The first is by Senator Wesely. Senator Wesely would move to amend. The amendment is on page 1645 of the Journal.

PRESIDENT: Senator Wesely, please.

CLERK: This amendment, Senator, strikes the Warner-Kristensen-Langford amendment.

SENATOR WESELY: Well, thank you. Mr. President, members, back to an issue that was quite an issue just a few days ago. I've got to express my disappointment in the Speaker, he's moved so quickly in moving this bill back to the floor of the Legislature the board of regents hasn't had time to change their mind again or position on the issue. (Laughter.) But I, myself, haven't changed my mind, and I know others on the floor have got concerns. So the amendment before you would strike the Warner amendment that was adopted just about seven or eight days ago, not very long ago. Of course I'd like to go back over it and try and make some arguments. I do anticipate the results of this amendment, and at the same time feel it's worth the effort to discuss and acknowledge, once again, the concerns that we have. Although I must admit I've mellowed dramatically from the last discussion that we had on the issue, having seen the comedy of errors that we've gone through in the past week or so it's hard to not have a little smile on your face as you begin the discussion about this issue. As the board of regents have vacillated between position for and against, and for and against, and for and against the Kearney issue, I guess today their position is to be okay on that issue, whatever that means. But we'll see how long that lasts. But, nevertheless, as we got into the whole issue last time I got to admit I was a little struck by surprise at the situation, because I had assumed, wrongfully it turned out, that with the Governor taking a position that we should study this issue and then act on the Kearney matter, the board of regents had taken a position, I thought, that we should study the issue and then act on the Kearney matter. But the board of trustees, and they still have this position, that we should study the issue and then act on the Kearney issue. But the Attorney General had said we need to have a constitutional amendment to act on the Kearney issue. You can't do it through a piece of legislation. I thought with all that that it was clearly going to be the case with LB 160 stuck in committee, and LB 247 to do a study out on the floor,