

September 28, 1992 LB 10

fact, in the future we're going to cut it to 50 or 25 or whatever that policy situation would be, then that would probably be more appropriate. But instead what we've done is we've enticed in 1,100 people into the program, then decided to cut back that particular amount. In retaliation for saying yes, the state does need to save some money and if you want to do it somehow with respect to the National Guard program, well, then let the higher education institutions share some of that brunt. And, like I say, we're not hiding a thing, we recognize the fact that that is an additional burden to them. But I also submit that if we cut it back to a \$500 cap, much as like in the bill, that the universities and higher educational institutions will not have as much credit hour production because the students won't be able to afford to attend and they'll cut back their amount of usage. And there isn't probably anyone here who is going to college that if you were under some kind of a scholarship program and they cut your scholarship back to a fixed dollar amount that instead of taking 15 hours you might drop back to 9 or 12 or some other that fitted into your budget for what you can afford. And so the bottom line is the university's Cash Funds will not be what they probably projected if, in fact, they're factoring these National Guard students because they're going to cut back on their amount of activity as well and, at that point, the university comes back and says, aha, our Cash Funds didn't meet what we projected them to be so now we have a deficit consideration to go with the Cash Funds that go into it. The tuition remission thing has been kind of an elusive, difficult situation because it's one of those funded mandates, if you will. We mandate that the university, in many cases, take on these students or take on certain activities and then we reinforce it with the tuition remission that whatever that shortfall will be. At this point, like I say, I would not have any problem with killing this bill from top to bottom and, if fact, we want to dig into the university a little more or whatever, that's another decision to make. But I'm not hiding the fact that higher education will be reduced in the terms of the amount of Cash Funds they have by using this technique because the students will get what they were promised at the price that they were promised and either the state and/or the university or some combination of those two are ultimately going to be the ones that are going to pay for it. So, with that, I offer the committee amendment.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Conway. We'll now vote on the committee amendments. All those in favor please vote aye,