

before the study is complete? My fear is that we're going to end up with the same problem and make the same mistake we made with the Syracuse Tax Study and the changes in the income tax system, we're going to be back here in two years saying, well, goodness, we shouldn't have embarked down that path, and we're going to have to make changes and people are going to come in here and say, I sure didn't know that was going to happen if Kearney State was incorporated into the university system. My point is let's not make the error now, whether we enact this amendment or not is meaningless. The enactment of it or adding it to it doesn't change the basic flaw in the whole bill, and that is we're conducting a study of some...and yet we're...we're proceeding before the recommendations of that study are ever made by incorporating Kearney into the university system. I don't think that is proper, I don't think that is wise policy, I don't think that is just basic, common sense. So I would...I don't plan to vote for this amendment. I suppose it will get overwhelming results and everybody will go out and say, look what a good job we've done by adding a meaningless amendment. The fact of the matter is we're going to regret the decision to add Kearney to the university system this year. And, if we keep proceeding in this direction and that ultimately occurs, we're going to look back, in two years, and be here in 1990 or 1991, or whenever, and say, what did we do this for, we made this mistake but we sure weren't aware of the consequences. I don't think we want to do that again. I don't think we want to go through the same mistake process that we went through with the tax increase that was enacted in 773.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I rise to support the Wehrbein amendment. The regents have gotten a lot of criticism for their position on this particular bill, obviously some of it justified, but I think some of it may be overblown. Maybe the more pleasant diversions of this body is regent bashing, and we do it fairly well and fairly effectively. We usually wait until the budget comes up, and I'm sure we'll have plenty fodder to do university bashing when that comes up, too. But we're kind of getting our swords sharpened on the regents early this year with their position on 247. And I think we might have been just a little bit unfair with them. I met with one of the regents and staff from the university over the weekend. They had basically three concerns with 247 as it is currently written, I guess, because none of the amendments had