

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

February 1, 1999 LB 243

three not-for-profit institutions which are accredited by national organizations recognized by the U.S. Department of Education could not continue to participate in PEAP unless the bill was passed. Philosophically, the commission favors inclusiveness versus exclusiveness. They are not being regionally accredited because of any lack of standards. It is that they are accredited under a national organization as opposed to a regional organization.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I appreciate that explanation because I didn't get to hear all of your opening remarks on this, and maybe that is something that we could look at between now and Select File. You raise some interesting questions and arguments here. So, even though I said...got up and said that I thought I would be opposed to changing that, your explanation has helped me and I think that we probably should take a look at that. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Madam President, members of the Legislature. I try not to speak more than once on a bill and I usually am restrained. It's just that tone in this debate that says, gosh, if you support the National Guard, you'll vote for this bill. It just rankles me so I have to get up here and say, look, I'm trying to support the National Guard, and I agree, as I said, that, in fact, we probably need to do something about recruitment. My objection, by the way, was not encapsulated in the Beutler amendment. The Beutler amendment going as 70 percent I voted for because I think it showed a restraint on the bill, but let me tell you my objection again. A hundred percent might be the right percentage today. I might vote for 100 percent today given the information. It is that the 100 percent becomes a matter of law and permanent that is the problem. It is the fact that conditions today may justify this but four years from now or three years from now they may not, and we will have the shoe on the other foot. It will be very hard to reduce this when it's in the statute this way. Let me give you a couple of examples of things that I'd be happy to support. I'd probably go with 100 percent today if I thought that in three years, let's say, it would reduce back to 50 percent again and had to be passed a second time so that we could see the kind of conditions. That's different than a