

April 30, 1979

LB 494

been here since that particular formula for seventh and eighth graders has been in effect, neither have I heard it ever criticized as not being adequate nor have I ever heard it, nor do I recall at least any bills ever being introduced to change it so it probably isn't all that bad. My interest in this went back a long ways. Did they introduce legislation way back when nonresident tuition was so much a day to make it actual cost which at that time it would have raised it? At this point actual cost times 120% probably will reduce it in some areas but it seems to me that there ought to be a reasonable basis on which to arrive at a nonresident tuition rate and any state aid bill is an appropriate place to discuss that issue and I am offering it today in order to again discuss the issue and perhaps arrive at a reasonable basis for setting nonresident tuition.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is the adoption of the Warner amendment to LB 494. I have three lights on. Let me see whether they want to speak. Senator Murphy, do you wish to speak to the amendment?

SENATOR MURPHY: I would remind the body that Senator Warner's bill relating to state aid in 1973 did, in fact, carry that concept. The elementary section of the law at that time made that provision. It was in the law, 1.2. Subsequently we added, under Senator Warner's bill, the provision the 1.2 would apply to all classes including secondary. I can only say that I support wholeheartedly the concept. 120% is a pretty good penalty to pay. The idea that this in any way creates a burden seems unreal to me. One of the principal functions of cost of education is number of students and to say that a receiving district does not benefit by the receipt of additional students is utterly false, particularly when those students come to that district with a 20% override in cost factor. I support Senator Warner's motion.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Koch, do you wish to speak to the Warner amendment?

SENATOR KOCH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is difficult to speak to Senator Warner's amendment only without speaking to the body of the bill but I will attempt to do that. Senator Warner knows as well as I do that if you get into a bill that treats insured needs as well as foundation then you should be speaking to the business of nonresident tuition. 486 which is a bill that I have that I thought was going to be discussed at the same time as 494 deals with nonresident