

I don't think that has changed any and perhaps we might more profitably spend our time going to Washington and reiterating our support for the federal role in financing students' education. So I would oppose this amendment. It doesn't solve anything. It probably makes things a lot worse over the long run. So I urge you to vote against it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I would rise to oppose the amendment, the proposed amendment, for a number of reasons. I am not going to spend time on the dollar cross of a million and a half, that is obvious that we do not have that. But there is a couple of other points that concern me even more. The first is that the suggestion is that we need to do this because of reduced federal funding that may or may not occur. It is true there is some reduction this year but whether it is going to occur next year, in fact, is not determined and again to appropriate funds for lapsed or discontinued federal funds when it has not yet occurred, at least a full impact has not occurred, to me is a very ill conceived policy and the reason is that we are going to have a whole host, I suspect, a whole host of requests next session to pick up a variety or consider picking up a variety of programs currently funded in part or totally by federal funds. If we begin to make that selection now, what in effect you are going to be doing is making a selection really before you know the options that you are going to have to be looking at. And if we are going to run with a 3 percent reserve, if we are going to run on the razor's edge on that side of the budget, then you better understand that there is not going to be any appreciable beginning balance next year and with a whole host of federal programs that you will be asked without any question to pick up in part, you better not start using that reason now, it's for sure you are going to at least have a very great potential of significant problems to deal with in '87. Now, I also have a problem with the statute in which the proposed funds would be distributed. Reference has been made to Mr. Oberg's, the lobbyist for the independent schools, article that was submitted. A suggestion has been made there are some things about that that probably ought to be described differently. I would like to talk a bit about the Nebraska scholarship programs which are in excess of some \$7 million currently to the public institutions. A suggestion was made that 77 percent of that is nonneed based. Well, if you look at this in the Nebraska funds, that is correct, but there is a variety of reasons for it. One