

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 12, 2005

LB 426

of state funds for destruction of human embryos. Anyway, there was a number of those bills and it was a long hearing, and the university brought in quite a parade of witnesses, testifiers, and their testimony was really starkly different from what the university had brought to the committee just 12 months or so earlier, because the bills that we were debating that day or considering that day were very similar, if not identical, to bills that had been offered in the previous biennium. And in the previous biennium, when the university came in, essentially what they said, if I can summarize in just a very few words, they said, look, we're not doing any of that kind of stuff, therefore, we don't have a position on those bills. That's what they said back then. But when they came in this year their story was quite different. They said, we're not doing that stuff, but we want to do that stuff; that's where we want to go. So they were no longer neutral on those bills. And I raised some questions at that time about how they could have such a radical change, what I perceived to be a radical change, in their position. Had the Board of Regents taken some action that I wasn't aware of? And, no, no one claimed that the board had acted on this or spoken on it. But there was not a doubt in anyone's mind in that room that day that the university's position had changed quite substantially, and I'm concerned about that, because I'm concerned about where the university is trying to go on some of these issues. And I think it's entirely appropriate for the Legislature to draw a bright line. After all, we fund, through our appropriations process, a very large percentage of the university budget and we ought to have some say about how those funds are spent. And I don't have any qualms whatsoever about trying to draw a bright line and send the university a message, this is where you can go, this is where you can't go. I think that's fully within our prerogative as state legislators. And we did draw a line of sorts a few years ago, and we're reviewing that now to see whether or not that line is...needs to be revised in any way, and that's what this amendment is all about. And as I stated at the outset, maybe the amendment isn't needed. Maybe we've already covered that in our existing language. And if that's the case, I'll pull it, and we can get on with a discussion of the main amendment that Senator Chambers has offered us which, as you know, I oppose. That's what the amendment is about. That's why