

with it the reality of being a public subsidy, the editorial goes on to say. The LR 390 study report notes that projected costs four years at a state university will in the year 2006, when today's newborns are first eligible to enroll, will be in the range, colleagues, of \$65,000, \$65,000. If we fail to enact now, let me ask you, colleagues, what kind of General Fund tax subsidy will the 100th Legislature be saddled with. The editorial point ignores the reality of the future. And they go on to say, a secret public subsidy for corporations. Corporations aren't in the bill. Also it can't be too secret if the editorial writers are writing about it. Another portion of the bill they talk about would allow state income tax deductions for tuition paid for all institutions of higher education. Presumably the eighty-eight reference is a mistake on their part, more importantly the editorial, itself, is the first suggestion I have seen or heard of a linkage between the two. There is no evidence here from other states which have adopted college savings plans of a link between the two colleges. Unrealistic to think that families which live paycheck to paycheck have the disposal income to sock away \$2,000 per year per child. The bill does not require a savings of \$2,000 a year per child in order to participate.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR CHIZEK: Two thousand is the maximum tax deduction. Simple arithmetic shows that if a parent 18 years ago, as I said earlier, began putting the \$5 away, the amount exclusive of interest, would equal \$4,680, almost, as I said, three-quarters of the cost today for the number of credit hours needed for the average bachelor's degree at UN-L. That hardly makes things unrealistic. The bill, they go on to say, would require state snooping, a blatant use of an emotional term. Did the newspaper feel this way when the energy tax credits were passed? Does it feel this way about proposals for tightening the scrutiny of LB 775? It is apparent to me that these exaggerated terms are being selectively applied in this editorial.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time has expired.

SENATOR CHIZEK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. You have heard the closing and the question is the adoption of the Chizek amendment to LB 140. Those in favor of that motion vote aye, opposed nay. Voting on