

NU 'children' are of voting age

It is unfortunate that the degrading drama of the Saturday NU Board of Regents meeting was not played before the entire UNL student body of 22,000.

Instead, only about fifty students witnessed a spectacle unequalled for petty contempt for students, wildly erroneous opinions and emotion that at times seemed to lack all sense of reason.

For the regents considered the two student jack-in-the-box residence hall proposals that pop up perennially—expanded visitation and use of alcohol by students in their rooms.

Regent Kermit Hansen of Omaha was an articulate and impressive exception to the predominating negative attitude. His enthusiastic support was appreciated by students.

One came away from the meeting convinced that the majority of the five regents present, specifically Edward Schwartzkopf of Lincoln, Robert Simmons Jr. of Scottsbluff and Robert Koefoot of Grand Island, cannot treat student requests with either civility or sincerity.

Not only were the students who attempted to testify in support of the proposals hurried and interrupted, they were in some cases the object of regential ridicule.

The student regents did not fare much better. When Regent (and UNL student body president) Jim Say finally had his turn to speak on the alcohol proposal, he was constantly interrupted by Regent Schwartzkopf.

Regent Simmons, who perused an Omaha World-Herald during part of the discussion, gave

students the benefit of his wisdom when he said, "Students are children and we ought to treat them like children."

Regent Koefoot seemed offended that considering the proposal took too much time. When his name was called for both votes, he answered in a loud, imperial roar of arrogance.

Regent Schwartzkopf, in his incessant demands to the proponents of the proposal to "give me a benefit of having liquor in the dorms," occupied the oratorical floor most of the time. His lack of moderation certainly didn't deserve an answer and neither did his question.

There are no unique benefits of having alcohol in the residence halls, or in society at large, for that matter. Nonetheless, use of alcohol by adult individuals, the issue the regents were asked to consider, is a question of rights.

If Regent Schwartzkopf wants to start a crusade against liquor in the state, the nation and the world, as he said, let him do it on his own time, as a private citizen, not as a representative of an adult constituency which already has given its tacit approval of alcohol use through state liquor laws.

Or let him apply the same prohibitive standards equally to the university—let no liquor flow at off-campus administrative soirees and in the Memorial Stadium pressbox.

With or without the regents' approval, alcohol use by adults (i.e., students) is an accepted and traditional part of society.

Schwartzkopf asked why students wanted booze on campus when "there are fifty bars all five minutes away." In another moment he addressed the problem of drunken driving. It is unfortunate he could not understand that alcohol experiments will not end in tragedy when the student is safe in his own room—as opposed to wending his woozy way home after a pub crawl.

The real victim of the proposal was a proposed alcohol education program in the residence halls, which was defeated along with the proposal for alcohol use.

Regent Simmons' comment about the students as children seemed to hark back to the outmoded concept of the university and "in loco parentis"—that the university should play a morally guiding role in students' lives.

The problem with that concept, as students are well aware, is that it is a dusty remnant of another age—when students were not legally adults.

The NU Board of Regents, along with the ASUN Senate, a student-body referendum and the Faculty Senate rejected that notion in their definitive 1968 statement, "The Student in the Academic Community." Every entering university student is given a copy of that declaration of student rights and roles.

The Daily Nebraskan would suggest that in their action, the regents violated both the letter and the spirit of that document, especially the following portions:

B. Rules and Regulations

Regulations are not comprehensive codes of conduct, but rather expressions of the general expectations of the academic community. Upon admission to the University each student should receive statements of these expectations.

Rules and regulations should:

- 1) seek the best possible reconciliation between personal freedom and necessary order.
- 2) be formulated with equitable participation by students in areas affecting student life. . .

University students enjoy all the rights and privileges of citizenship. Students are subject, however, to the special obligations which accrue to them as members of the academic community. Institutional effort should be exerted to develop, not inhibit, intellectual and personal development of students by the exercise of rights of citizenship both on and off campus.

"Equitable participation by students"—certainly that guideline was lost in the chaos of Saturday's regents' meeting.

It is significant that the five (of eight) regents present delayed a decision about which bank should handle university endowment funds until the full board could consider the matter, but did not accord the same respect to a student request.

For the second time in two years, a well-thought out proposal for providing alcohol in the dorms was defeated; by a vote of four (Schwartzkopf, Koefoot, Simmons and board chairman James Moylan of Omaha) to one (Hansen).

Absent from the meeting were Regents Robert Prokop of Wilbur, Robert Raun of Minden and Kermit Wagner of Schuyler.

Expiration of terms of office will place Wagner, Prokop, Koefoot and Moylan on the ballot this November if they wish to continue as regents.

They and others might note that students do have some interest in how they are treated by the board. For student "children" also are student voters.

Vince Boucher

d.n.
soapbox

rarefied
air

Legislative wheels grind slowly

By Dick Piersol

On Crofton Sen. Jules Burbach's outer office wall is a plaque that reads: "If you think taxation without representation was bad, you should see it with representation."

Burbach is Speaker of the Nebraska Legislature. He is responsible for preparing an agenda each day, noting which bills will be considered on final reading and general and select files. Rarely do the senators finish all the business on a given day's agenda. Just as rarely do they finish all the business begun in a given session of the Legislature.

There are now, with the current 60-day session about half over, 97 bills on general file and almost 300 still in committee. Burbach estimates only about 100 bills will get to final reading before the Unicameral adjourns.

The problem of inefficiency in legislative government is interesting particularly in Nebraska, considering the

unique distinction of its one-house Legislature. We are ahead of the game in that respect, but the problem still exists.

According to Burbach, the solution is limiting the number of bills introduced. Each senator may introduce 10 bills, but committees also may introduce bills—as many as they see fit.

Another possibility, Burbach said, is conducting public hearings of bills in the morning, coming to order in the afternoon and staying until the day's prepared agenda is finished—even if it takes until late evening. Burbach thinks that probably would eliminate much repetitious debate. Currently, the senators are in session from 9 or 9:30 a.m. until noon with public hearings conducted in the afternoon.

Nebraska is one of few states which require public hearings on all bills, and Burbach is not ready to give that

up, nor are many others, although it is the most time consuming part of the Legislature.

The non-partisanship of the Nebraska Legislature is another feature which may slow the order of business. Party caucuses may not predetermine the outcome of issues, but again that's not necessarily bad.

Burbach thinks non-partisanship gives the people of the state more input.

Sen. John Cavanaugh of Omaha agrees. He says a non-partisan Legislature is more efficient, "from the standpoint of serving the public."

Another bottleneck is the requirement that all bills be read in full on final reading—some of those bills more closely resemble *War and Peace* than simple statute revision. No one will say if that requirement was made when some of the senators were less familiar with the three Rs than they are today.

But Utica Sen. Douglas Bereuter is not among those ready to scrap complete final reading. He said sometimes mistakes are discovered in bills after they have reached that point.

However, his constituents are dismayed by the apparent inattention and general chaos prevailing on the floor, he said.

Omaha Sen. Eugene Mahoney said a possible solution to the problem of unfinished business at the end of each session is biennial sessions of unlimited length, an idea the state discontinued after 1969 and the infamous 165 day session. A bill providing biennial sessions was heard publicly last week.

Mahoney opposes limiting the number of bills a senator may introduce. He has not introduced a bill of his own for "four or five years," but said he sees no reason to limit other senators.

"Efficiency," Mahoney says, "is not necessarily what democracy is all about."

ralph by ron wheeler

