add this intent language indicates that a majority of us are opposed to it. That talk about problems the Athletic Department may be having with the NCAA is not going to override our responsibility to prohibit discrimination in the granting of student aid in programs that we, as a Legislature, create for needy students.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.
SENATOR CHAMBERS: The amendment that was adopted by the Legislature, offered by Senator Korshoj, added a total of $\$ 250,000$ to two need-based student assistance programs. My amendment relates to the granting of aid under those two need-based programs, and the amendment says that there can be no discrimination in the granting of these requests for assistance. other than that, I just don't know what to say in response to Senator Goodrich's attempt to strip an amendment that says there should not be discrimination. The only alternative is to conclude that he is in favor of discrimination. He wants the university to discriminate because all the amendment says is that there won't be discrimination, and I hope after taking...

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time.
SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...the proper position, the Legislature will vote against Senator Goodrich's motion.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Rod Johnson, please.
SENATOR R. JOHNSON: I call the question.
SPEAKER BARRETT: There has only been one...there is only one other light, Senator Johnson. I will not recognize that. Senator Warner, did you wish to make a statement?

SENATOR WARNER: Yeah, Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I wonder, Senator Chambers, if I can ask...and these are very straight-up questions, Senator Chambers, so I guess...because $I$ voted no the other day, I raised some questions that no one responded to and I need to understand them. This is intent language. Now I assume it would be the intent of the Legislature that the agency responsible for setting up rules and regs, which in this case is the Coordinating Commission, would be expected to pay some attention to that, at least they ought to.

