

Lynch's amendment would basically let somebody from California come in, get some money and go back to California. And, you know, if we're going to help them there, help educate them, then I think we need to keep them here in this state and that's what LB 505 is designed to do. So I realize that the private colleges are needed and they do a very good job and that we need to help them also, but 505 is not the right way to do it. There's several ways out there that we could do it besides with this bill. There's...the scholarship program in LB 400 that was passed in 1990 includes everything that they would...are actually asking for with this amendment. I think that's the approach we need to come back in and use. By saying that they will take every...all of the funds over, over \$300,000, if we would ever want to increase this program or if there's ever any funds there, they would have to go to this program. I think a better approach then is to come back in with LB 400 and really target those schools, those universities that are helping our health situation in this state rather than to attempt to come in and to put them underneath the med college where they would be under the Regents and trying to get students to go back to rural areas. So I think rather than to go with this approach, I would be willing to work with Senator Lynch or the private colleges and I have told them that, that I just think that we need to find a different approach than with this amendment, so I will be opposing the amendment. Thank you.

**SPEAKER BAACK:** Thank you, Senator Schellpeper. Senator Wesely.

**SENATOR WESELY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members, I think that Senator Lynch's intent is a worthy one to try and understand the private sector educational institution's role in educating our health professionals. The problem I have is the drafting of this amendment is inadequate and I would actually ask Senator Lynch to consider withdrawing the amendment and I would be happy to work with him and others perhaps as well on something for Select File. The problem is that the amendment doesn't provide for clarity in how you would work through the system to have these people actually serve our rural areas or our underserved areas as well as in the particular areas that we have a greater need for practitioners. It's kind of a generalized addition to the loan program we have in place for private institutions and says something about priority can be given or may be given to those who might practice in rural areas. Put that next to what 505 talks about where the borrower under this program and 505 if they end up practicing outside of Nebraska has to repay