

amendment does. So I think while the concept, Senator Warner's concept may very well be a good concept, and may be something that ought to be introduced as a bill next year, both AM1574 and this amendment, I don't think it is appropriate to do that without at least giving the proprietaries a chance to come in at a committee hearing and give their side of the story, without giving a chance to the independents on this type of concept to give their side of the story, give a chance to the university system to give their side. I think...because I think AM1574, along with the amendment to the amendment, do break new ground. They do some consolidation of different programs. They change who shares in those programs. I think it is something that in fairness to the public we ought to have a public hearing on, but I can't stand up here and say the concept is not good. But I think it is not appropriate as a Select File amendment and, with that, I would urge that the amendment to the amendment be rejected, and that AM1574 also be rejected.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Lindsay. I will now recognize the senators in the following order: Senator Warner, Senator Lynch, and Senator Nelson. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Well, Madam President, of course, this amendment was offered in response to the discussion that was held on General File that it was inappropriate to...because I raised the issue then to expand the funding to the proprietaries as they were for profit, and I thought at that time, I made the policy argument from the students' viewpoint that that was not inappropriate, but I merely bowed to what I understood to be the will of the introducers to not do that. The proprietaries will continue to share in the matching of the federal funds as they always have and, in fact, as is required. I would venture to say, also, that probably the change that was made two years ago with the intent of assisting the independents by virtue of the formula probably resulted in more funds going to the proprietaries than was anticipated. So I don't look upon that as a loss in any sense, but, again, it makes it very clear, certainly if there is a desire to have a separate plan for proprietaries, that, too, could be established some time in the future, but I think you'd have a much cleaner scholarship program with adoption of this amendment and then adopting as amended. It actually generates more money for the independents. It doesn't have any affect upon the distribution between independents, and it certainly will permit in the future those who wish to restrict scholarships in the public institutions to