

some of these suggestions as far as let's make sure that when we're all finished that this, in fact, serves students of Nebraska. Students today are no longer 18 to 24. Students are of all ages, particularly a lot more students in the 28 to probably 45 category. And I think a lot of our discussions on higher education tend to forget that. I think some of the proposals that we need to look at seriously would open up the kind of access that we need statewide for a changing economy. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator McFarland.

SENATOR MCFARLAND: Thank you, Mr. President, fellow senators. I'm going to vote against the amendment, or excuse me, against the bill, not because I don't favor the study. When we debated this issue and discussed this issue in the Education Committee there was a general consensus, I felt, that the study was the most appropriate and the most reasonable way to approach the whole issue. We discussed LB 247 as a way to address the problem, a way to examine the problem before any final action was taken. And the vote on LB 247 was, as I recall, fairly supportive of its advancement. I think we had six, maybe seven votes. I don't recall that we had a long discussion in Education Committee on it. The vast majority of the people on the Education Committee, if not all of us, agreed to advance it. I don't recall the vote. We also considered LB 160 that is now attached as an amendment to LB 247. And there was a lot of uncertainty in the Education Committee concerning the discussion or concerning that particular bill. I don't think there were a lot of people who felt strongly, adamantly in favor of LB 160. And, as a matter of fact, I think it was reflected on the roll call. As I recall, there were about two of the people on the Education Committee who were nonvoters. And one of them, I think as I recall correctly, one of them voted no, not to advance it. Then when it was determined that there were at least four votes not to advance LB 160 out of committee, then I think that one or two of the nonvoters suddenly changed to a yes vote. And I think one of the no votes changed to a yes vote, so it came out as a four to four vote. That vote did not reflect, I don't think, the discussion within the committee because I don't think that it was a close vote. I think a lot of those votes were posturing as far as the Education Committee was concerned, not a lot of those votes, a few of those votes. But now we have LB 160 onto this bill. I don't think it's appropriate that it should be there. I think the Education