

programs, budget accounting programs, has no effect on how it is distributed. It would have no effect next year on how it's distributed. If LB 651 is the only bill that passes or none passes at all, the fact that the money is in two programs within the budget bill the accounting program has only one impact and that is the one about maintenance of effort. And the question is on the overmatch if you want to lock the state into a distribution formula for scholarships that is determined by the federal government or if you want to have the flexibility for the state to distribute the overmatch in whatever form that the Legislature and the state decides here, that's the only issue. Both programs in the budget could be distributed the same way but you're locked in if you do the other and I can appreciate some perhaps would like to lock it in. But I don't think that is the best public policy. I think it's much better that the state has the flexibility to use on into the future whichever of the distribution formulas that the majority of this body select without being encumbered with a maintenance of effort type of requirement. I can appreciate that those...well, let me rephrase that. When you have worked...if you work with budgets over a period of time, you become very leery of maintenance requirements of the federal government and they creep in all over the place. And what means of effort does, of course, is it restricts what states might do to meet changing conditions within that state and you have to always stay in compliance with whatever the feds do because you cannot reduce your level of match. And it always creates a problem and, as a matter of fact, I would suggest that sometimes it's a very adverse result of that maintenance of effort because you are hesitant to participate in some programs because once you start you can't get out. I'm not talking about the scholarships, I'm talking about the requirement of maintenance of effort in general. But the same policy issue is in existence here. So I would urge that you reject the amendment. It is not going to have any impact as to what is eventually done...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR WARNER: ...in the way of substantive distribution legislation, does not affect it, doesn't prevent maintenance of maintaining the existing distribution, it merely does not lock the state into a maintenance effort from this time forward which they cannot do differently if they chose to do so. The argument on distribution ought to occur on the basic legislation because that is what will govern, not this, but the state ought to want