

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President and members, this is a bill which you may have noted that has to do with nonresident tuition and the argument is, how much should be charged nonresident students to go to high school in a Class III high school, or a Class II? In the present situation there is a very complicated formula by which the Department of Education calculates the maximum amount that a district may charge nonresident students. And I have passed out on your desk some information which indicates, in my opinion, that some of those charges are excessive. You will note that there is a school in Madison County, for instance, that has two students served and the charge per student is over \$46,000. Now I think most of us would agree that's an excessive charge. However, and I don't have it on this sheet, but there is other information...if you continue that sheet on, you will see that's in descending order, that it gets down to \$15,000 per student and \$14,000, but then it goes on down below that and the last one on the list which I have, but you don't have, is less than a thousand dollars per student. So you see the receiving districts in those cases are losing money because they are not paying per pupil cost. The per pupil cost in high schools averages around, somewhere around 35, 36, \$3,700 dollars a year. So you see there is a wide variance in the amount of nonresident tuition which is charged. Now my bill, LB 1126 gets away from this formula and merely says that the district can charge anywhere from per pupil cost up to one and a half times per pupil cost, which I think is a reasonable amount. However, there will be an amendment by Senator Withem and Morehead which would, in effect, become the bill. It would clean up, somewhat, the present formula so hopefully it will not come out with these extreme charges that we now have. So I am prepared to accept the Withem-Morehead amendment with one substantial change. It's...in my opinion, it's not substantial but it's logical and after the amendment has been adopted or has been introduced I would explain my one objection. Now yesterday there was a meeting of the groups on both sides of this issue and there was not a meeting of the minds. This is the amendment which was prepared by the state's school boards association and while it does, as I mentioned, have some good things in it, it has one item there that I cannot accept and in fact would rather see the bill killed than have this adopted because it goes absolutely in the opposite direction of the gist of my original bill. So with that brief explanation of what the