

September 28, 1992 LB 10

So it strikes all the new language, reinstates all of the old language. Then, where the present law says 75, talking about the percent of the tuition assistance, 75 will be stricken and 50 will be put in its place. The operative date of this bill is July 1, 1993. So everything in the existing law will stay just as it is because this bill will change nothing before July 1, 1993. And when July 1, 1993 comes then that 50 percent, which replaces the 75 percent, will apply from that date on out to everybody, until the Legislature decides to make a change. So now to state that as briefly as I can, the amendment will strike all of the new language, reinstate all of the old language, which puts us right where the law is now. The reduction from 75 to 50 percent will take effect on everybody from July 1, 1993 forward. I support Senator Bohlke's amendment. And if you have any questions of me, then I'll be happy to answer them.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. Senator Bohlke's amendment, in my opinion, is certainly better than the bill in the committee amendment form. A couple of differences between Senator Bohlke's amendment and the Appropriations Committee bill as introduced, the one thing, by going to a percentage instead of a dollar amount, basically you're going to affect all guard people the same, which there is a good reason to do that. But the only difference is that under the Appropriations Committee recommendation we had a \$500 threshold, basically all those guard folks attending a community college would have their tuition reimbursed in full. The guard individuals attending the state colleges would have most, almost all of their tuition reimbursed in full. And obviously those at the university would be the ones that would take...have to pay the largest difference under the committee bill. And Senator Bohlke's, you're treating it...you're treating everybody the same, and there's a good argument why you want to do that. The other situation that's different is the actual dollar amount of cost savings to the state is more under the bill as originally introduced, as the bill as originally introduced estimated cost savings was, for next fiscal year was \$447,000, and for the following fiscal year \$511,000, under Senator Bohlke's amendment the savings to state General Fund is only about \$335,000, and \$357,000 the year after that. Obviously that difference will continue to grow as years go on. I guess from my point of view we don't need to spend all evening talking about this bill. If Senator Bohlke's amendment gets adopted I certainly will be