

September 28, 1992 LB 10

although I support...I oppose the amendment as brought by the Government Affairs Committee. One of the reasons I support, or one of the reasons, Madam President, I failed to address you, I'm sorry. I don't support the amendment as brought by the Government Affairs Committee and one of the reasons is because of the point that Senator Chambers made. I don't think it's going to be particularly efficient for the schools and universities to have to absorb this tuition increase. So even though I will be voting for Senator Chambers' amendment, as I understand it, I will oppose the committee amendment as proposed by the Government Affairs. If we are going to support this particular area of tuition, and I happen to think that it is a useful tool for the National Guard, that we need to do it straight up and have it supported by the state as a whole and not put the burden on the part of primarily the universities in this case. It simply will add another burden to theirs...to them. We are already taking a pretty good cut again this year out of the university budget, as well as some of the other state colleges, community colleges. So I think, in a sense, it's kind of a false economy to attempt to do what we're doing here. In fact, if this amendment were to go forward, I probably would oppose the bill in its entirety and try for another approach to try to at least hold in check our expenditures on this issue. We are trying to do it now because it would help for planning into the next year, but, if necessary, we can come back later on and work on it. But this has gone from a \$300,000 item in the early 1980s to over a million dollars in this present fiscal year. So it is an increase in expenditure, one I think we need to get control of and preferably check it, and it needs to be done fairly. I acknowledge that. I am not excited about upsetting a commitment that we have made to the many students that are taking advantage of this. And that's something that I'm sure willing to look at. But, by the same token, the savings that was implied in the bill as originally introduced was \$330,000, which simply takes us back to where we were about three or four years ago in terms of state budget. So it's an example of a budget area that's grown enormously in just the last few years and is one of the reasons that we see our budget growing like gangbusters in many areas. All worthy causes but it's somewhat unchecked. So if you're inclined to go along with this, I would support Senator Chambers' amendment but I will be opposing the committee amendments.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. Senator Lindsay, followed by Senator Schimek, Conway, Pirsch and Schrock.