

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

January 23, 2003 LB 107

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...since what they'd have to pay to the bank is 5 percent, what they'd have to pay to the bondholder is 5 percent. Why would they not borrow from a regular lender?

SENATOR JENSEN: The institution? Why would they not go to a regular lender?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yeah, if they'd pay 5 percent to the lender and they're going to pay 5 percent to the bond buyer.

SENATOR JENSEN: It's all whoever the financial manager is of that institution might decide I think we would do better with a bond. If not, they would go to the bank and borrow money.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But there would be a way for them to borrow money, isn't that right, even without this bill?

SENATOR JENSEN: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: You want a bill like this because money could be...that would ordinarily be used for certain activities, can be diverted to another usage, and this money coming in through the sale of these bonds can take the place of the money that would have been spent otherwise for these other activities. Is that true?

SENATOR JENSEN: Yes, that is true, and to be competitive with other schools that already have this opportunity.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: How many people do you know who said they're going to go to Concordia, if that's one of...is that a school in Nebraska, Concordia, or is that in Kansas?

SENATOR JENSEN: The Concordia I refer to is in Kansas.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So how many students look at the way a school is financed in making a decision as to whether they're going to go to that school?

SENATOR JENSEN: I don't know. That's between the student and the parents, I guess, as to where the student decides to go.