

back to the committee amendments. The committee amendments, as they have been discussed at least off and on throughout the discussion up till this point basically gets down to a basic philosophy. What the committee did under the committee amendments was saying, yes, we are in a time of fiscal crisis or nearing that crisis and we're anticipating an ever-increasing slide in that direction, we have to try to grab ourselves by the financial bootstraps and hold the whole process together and in so doing one of the ideas was here is a way that we can shift three hundred and forty some thousand dollars, I believe was the fiscal note on it when it originally came down, to shift that away from state budgets. What we did is we shifted those out to National Guard members who, like I say, were recruited with the idea that they would have 75 percent of their tuition costs covered. Part of that shift, if you will note from the original green copy, was a \$500 cap. Now a \$500 cap could very easily be very significantly different for an individual who was aggressively trying to complete their undergraduate degree under this program in that \$500, if they were attending the university, and that is a fiscal year, that is not a semester, a fiscal year \$500 cap is the most award they could get, is either going to be in a situation where the financial burden and that we are saving state money is shifted to that individual or that person stretches out his higher education performance for a much longer period of time than he would have otherwise simply because he cannot afford to go beyond that \$500 cap. If you look at the tuition at the University of Nebraska for a person who is aggressively going after the degree, where you're looking at two regular semesters and maybe in some cases where a lot of these are adult learners who participate in the summer sessions, that is a rather severe stretching out of their academic career by having that \$500 cap. Also, in light of the increase, there was talk about, well, we're reducing it from 75 percent support down to 50. Well, for that individual, that is, in essence, a 100 percent increase. We start talking about cutting the university budget 1.4 percent or whatever that may be, for that individual who we make such a policy change to, that's a 100 percent increase in the amount of support that he receives or that he has to pay, from 25 percent up to 50 is a doubling of that amount. Also, Senator Moore and Senator Warner talked about the fact that how, well, if, in fact, we put that burden on the university or on the higher educational system, then, in essence, that just puts the strain back on the General Funds. Well, if that's the theory that you subscribe to relative to budget cutting, then, obviously, there's no reason to ever cut