

May 9, 1989

LB 812

think in LB...I want to say 651, and another bill, Senator Warner's, I believe it's 438 or something coming down the pipeline which we'll probably never get to today. But this is a major shift and it is a shift on these student loans from the public schools, the Kearney, the Chadrons, the university students to the private schools and I have not one thing against the private schools, but I think the body needs to know that this may or may not be taking away from the haves and the have nots and it does not necessarily mean that those that can afford to attend an \$8,000 school have the money. It may mean that they are better qualified students and maybe those are the ones that we really need to educate and that they are just as entitled to the dollars and I have no question with that. But this student loan, it's a bigger concern than I think a lot in the body realize and you kind of got to get into it, the Pell grants are favored towards probably the more expensive schools, so it is a major concern and it is more of an issue and I wish the body would watch it real close and then make your wishes known.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Withem, would you like to close, please?

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, I would. I appreciate Senator Warner's remarks, appreciate Senator Nelson's views on the substantive issue that concerns student financial aid and prefer not to respond to any of her remarks. They are more appropriate remarks around the discussion on when we get to substantive legislation. I think the intent of the discussion this morning was to clearly indicate the intent of the Legislature not to make Section 11, 812, be substantive legislation. It is a concern of our Appropriations Committee which I personally don't share, but I may also point out that I personally did not serve on the Appropriations Committee three or four years ago when they were looking feverishly for programs to cut and were confronted from time and time again with an inability to do that because of a federal maintenance of effort requirement, so I understand their concern with that. As I understand Section 11, it is just an attempt to deal with that federal maintenance of effort requirement. Whether or not it's successful in dealing with that, I still have questions, but it is not a substantive discussion on, or substantive legislative statutory changing of the manner in which scholarship dollars are distributed and should not be viewed as such by the Legislature. With that, I would withdraw that amendment.