

September 29, 1992 LB 29

SENATOR WARNER: One minute.

SENATOR CHIZEK: ...in Social Service cuts, considered leaving the affected without options. If you consider choosing between allowing Curtis students the same options but less expensively or leaving senior citizens no options, perhaps you had better understand the fate befalling Nebraska, perhaps you would discard knee jerk hyperbole for a larger perspective, perhaps you would have to, even if you didn't like what you beheld but you knew you had to behold it, and that was my response to the editorial. I submit to you that I was right when I brought it to this body for review. I submit to you that this is the right thing to do. I would submit to you that the per pupil costs are out of line, and I would submit to you...

SENATOR WARNER: Time. Senator Chizek, you are the next speaker, if you wish to continue.

SENATOR CHIZEK: ...and I would submit to you that of the seven programs, Senator Withem mentioned ten, there are seven, and we just happen to have the enrollment in some of these programs: Business and Management, this is 1992-93, 17 students; Conservation and Environmental Systems, 8; Feedlot Management, 16; Horticultural Systems, 15; Power Equipment Technology, 4; Agricultural Production, 53; Veterinary Technician, 69. Now as I understand it, the totals that they had given us earlier, prior to the hearing, was 177 full-time students. Now at no time have I ever commented about the quality of the programs offered. I certainly have commented on the cost per student. Between 8 and \$9,000 per student I think is excessively high. It has nothing to do with the ag school at Curtis, colleagues, it has to do with the cost and are all of these programs necessary, and should these more appropriately be a part of the community college system. That is very simply what we are talking about. I mean if you could have seen some of the letters and some of the calls, and, basically, there was those who attempted to make it an urban-rural fight, which it certainly is not. It certainly is not. I have had colleagues come to me and tell me that this is one of the most organized calling groups that they have had in the past few sessions, and I am not advocating doing away with all of these programs. Once again I am saying it can be done more appropriately with the community colleges, and certainly at a reduced cost. So I would hope that you would reject the amendment and then advance the bill.