

SENATOR SIECK: Mr. President and members of the body, I was one of the members of the Constitutional Revision Committee who voted to kill LR 5. In listening to the testimony, Senator Kilgarin did a beautiful job. I've got to admit this. She did a very good job of presenting her testimony but in listening to the Regents who....

PRESIDENT: Senator Sieck, may I interrupt you just a moment?

SENATOR SIECK: Yes.

PRESIDENT: There is a lot of conversation around underneath the balcony making a murmur that I would like to have order. Senator Sieck.

SENATOR SIECK: Thank you, Mr. President. In the committee we listened to both sides of the issue and several of the Regents did testify in opposing this resolution and I felt that they were very capable of operating the University of Nebraska in a policy position and in telling the administration what to do and when to do it. And I feel we do have some control of the purse strings. In listening to the Appropriations Committee this year the University of Nebraska was at the hearings several times, I understood, in different areas of appropriations for the University, so we do have some control. And the end result is that we give them a sum of money and then we expect them to operate it. Now are we, as the legislative body here, more versed in the University than the Regents are? I say that we are not and this is basically why I felt that we should kill this resolution. And I also feel as Senator Clark expressed that the people out there will not know what is going on and it will be very difficult for them to vote on an issue of this type. So I urge you not to bring this up in this body. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Rupp.

SENATOR RUPP: Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I rise to strongly support Senator Kilgarin in this effort. I detect a distinct lack of interest in the body in this resolution this morning and I would hope that members would pay just a bit more attention to this because as Senator Cullan said, I think it is very important. There are several old cliches that have been brought up so far in testimony and committee and so forth. I would point out at the outset that I don't think anyone has an axe to grind against the University. I firmly believe that this will not turn into a witch hunt or anything of the sort. It was also mentioned in committee about who was and who was not graduates of the University