

September 28, 1992 LB 10

past and there is little reason to believe that it wouldn't happen in the future. Secondly, what I believe the bill did when it was introduced was attempt to put a cap. This is not an issue that is new to us. It's an issue that's been before the body a number of times since the tuition credit was enacted in 1974 and every...in fact, there was at least a couple of runs that I can recall, and always there was an attempt to put a cap on the total amount of appropriation and that was our obligation that the state had. The bill, as introduced, clearly puts a cap, 500 times 12...times 1,200 pupils or 1,200 individuals, you had a \$600,000 maximum state cost, if I'm...it seems to me that that's a much more prudent way to do it is to retain some kind of a limitation on the level of appropriation that you're going to have. And it would seem to me that the bill, as introduced, is a clearer way to retain that limit, or I suspect if we do not do that, we'll be back visiting the issue again as we have visited it two or three times in the past in order to put some kind of a maximum dollar amount on this expenditure. But to assume that you're shifting this cost to...away from tax funds or away from whether it be General Fund or community colleges, you're kidding yourself because you reduce available funds for tuition, you add to the pressure for the property tax in the case of community colleges or you add to the pressure for the cost of General Fund money to a state institution.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Madam President and members, the first thing I'd like to do is simply just correct the record a little bit. Senator Lindsay, in his typical fashion of a good trial attorney, presented the truth very forcefully and he did not say anything other than the truth but he kind of led people to believe that somehow I was advocating the university be immune from any cuts here today and I wanted to correct that, as you're...as he mentioned, because he did sneak in there the across-the-board reduction for the university if about \$4.2 million and so some have said that's too high. Now that's indifferent. But I just wanted to make sure the record was clear that I wasn't someone here advocating they not take a share, whether or not it's the proper share is open for debate, obviously. And, obviously, as Senator Warner mentioned to me, you don't...it's not a direct reduction in state support if you do it this way, obviously, that...time will tell the way you build your budget. You figure in tuition and you build it around on General Funds and so, indeed, he's absolutely correct.