

May 15, 1973

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator Stahmer. Senator Stahmer, and then--Senator Fowler, did you wish to be heard again on the bill here? I see your light still on.

SENATOR STAHMER: Well, Mr. President, as one of the co-introducers of the bill, I think a great deal of effort has gone to make this compromise to which most of us I believe have agreed to. I'd like to call the question now in view of the, I'm sure other Senators have other bills that they're very much interested in hearing and I think we've heard this explanation so I call the question on this amendment.

PRESIDENT: All right, the previous question has been called. Does the chair see five hands? Thank you. The question is, shall the debate now close? All those in favor vote aye, all those opposed vote no. Motion is to close debate on LB 275, excuse me, on the Goodrich amendment. Stand by. Vice, Mr. Brown, didn't you read the amendment? I thought the Goodrich amendment was read in full before we started the debate. Senator Nore, we'll be glad to read it again if you want it read again. Motion before us is to close debate. Have you all voted? Clerk will record.

CLERK: 27 ayes, no nays to close debate.

PRESIDENT: Motion carries. Senator Goodrich, we're back to you. Senator Goodrich is now closing on his amendment to 275.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Senator Fowler had something to say and I would like to yield closing on this amendment to Senator Fowler.

PRESIDENT: All right, chair recognizes Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Okay, Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, I'm one of the co-sponsors of this bill and I too serve on the Education Committee with Senator Kelly. Since this bill came out of the committee five different individuals developed different amendments to split programs, create new programs, mandatorily create new programs and this amendment that Senator Goodrich has suggested is the effort of a compromise between these individuals to resolve these questions and to preserve the basic structure of the University. The important thing to remember is that the language says that the University may embrace the following colleges, it doesn't say it has to. For those programs that may not already exist it will be up to the Legislature and the Budget Committee to bind appropriations and facilities for these programs to actually work. What this does do immediately is create some new colleges that the University has wished to have created, these are already existing programs, it's not going to cost any additional money. It merely is to separate certain programs and to give some others collegiate status. I don't think the question of whether it's an institute or college of agriculture is important. I think the reason institute was chosen was because of the other bill that would set up the vice chancellor and I think would give a certain different distinction to this college and therefore perhaps deserves a different name. The creation of a college of Veterinary Medicine and Surgery or the possibility of that already is in the statutes and the existing language says that there may be a school of Veterinary Medicine and Surgery so there's no real change there. Engineering and Architecture are split, a thing that has been wanted by the faculties, by the professional engineers and architects and it's something that should be done. The college of continuing studies, the University College and the College of Public Affairs and Community Service are programs that already exist at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. They are on-going programs so setting up these colleges would not have any additional cost but it would give them a chance to run their own programs rather than being under some other colleges. So this amendment does not do anything drastic. It's acceptable to the University, it would not cost any additional