

September 30, 1992 LB 10

and that that certainly was a major part of the decision making. And in many cases that's one of the reasons why we have phase-in, phase-out attempts, because there's just a gut feeling on the part of most people that when they have something that there will be some continuation of that. And I think particularly in this case it's a situation where many of these people joined the guard, budgeted their life around getting an education with the idea that they had a 75 percent support. Again, I would support Senator Landis' amendment to Senator Schimek's amendment. I think that that could be offered. I think Senator Schimek's amendment is a movement in the right direction, and I will support it as it stands, but would be willing to take that one additional step and identify it to those people who are literally in a program, because these are people who are in their personal budgeting lifestyle, at a point in time where they are counting on that particular commitment. If the person is not in an institution of higher learning, at least he's not already restructured his whole budget and following that format, so I could live with Senator Landis'. I assume that, like I say, I don't see Senator Schrock's light on now, but I would assume that none of this addresses Senator Schrock's concern, and that's with the future recruitment. Are we going to be competitive and capable of recruiting the kinds of people into the National Guard, the young people who have professional aspirations and want to move into higher education as well and provide that whole format? I think that will put the State of Nebraska at a handicap. Senator Schrock brings up a good point. We're at roughly 84 percent strength now. As we're looking at the cutbacks, and there were many National Guards, Nebraska was looked...passed over this last go round at the federal level. But there have been many state National Guards who have been severely cut back in terms of what the federal support will be for National Guard as part of their whole scaledown process. And I think if Nebraska is viewed as a state who has trouble competing with recruitment and keeping their strengths up, then we're going to see units slowly disappearing. And I think in many cases those units provide valuable services as well as, let's face it, it's an economic opportunity, in many cases, for some of our young professionals to supplement their income, to provide that service, to get an education, and it feeds right in to what we keep saying Nebraska is all about. So I would hate to see these units closed out because, basically, we cannot keep them at strength and we don't have the tools to do that. So, with that, I suggest and do support the Schimek amendment, and am not adverse to one more