

the stigma may be one thing. I am sure another thing is once you earmark things in here the in perpetuity seem to escalate and increase. I think there is an attitude that the alcoholism program, whatever comes up, whatever is created, should be subject to legislative review from year to year through our appropriations process like absolutely everything else is. Let's assume next year, for example, and give it to you very straight, let's assume next year they decide they need another two million. At least this way, if they are going to get it from alcohol, they are going to have to come in here and present it to the Legislature and sell it again or they may decide this way that there is some additional funding required for a program in addition to the big increase in the alcohol taxes but that some of that should be matched by some general fund appropriations. It gives more flexibility and makes the process go through the Legislature year after year. I guess that is it. It is that simple, and as to who has the votes, I don't know that anybody knows that. I do know that this bill has been tried now. This is the seventh year in a row. I know I sponsored it three and I want to see a reasonable program put into effect. Talking to Senator Barnett and others who have been involved in it over the years, this seemed to be the method to get it done and absolutely done without any ifs, ands or buts.

SENATOR CULLAN: Thank you very much. I think Senator Decamp hit it very correctly when he said the main reason that we are going to put these funds in the general fund or put this into the general fund is so that if we need more money for operation of alcoholism programs in a few years we won't be so likely to put an additional tax on alcohol to take up for that cost. We might take some more out of the general fund. Well, personally, I like to see, I liked the philosophy that alcohol, tax on alcohol, to pay for the rehabilitation of alcoholics and I like it earmarked so that if we do need more money for this program we can come back with an additional tax on alcohol some day and I don't think it is bad to have a little higher tax on alcohol than we have now because it certainly is not a necessity. And I have talked to some of the parties that have been involved and many of them, I am sure, are accepting this compromise because they think that they can't get anything through and I think there are enough votes to move this. I went to see the Governor after I heard that he had agreed to this magical compromise and I asked him why and he said that he wanted to get something through but he, too, prefers to have it earmarked so that we will not divert funds from this tax on alcohol to education or something else in a few years. So the Governor does prefer to leave 204 the way it is right now but he is going to take whatever he can get from us, and if it means he has to put it in the general fund, he will accept that compromise. But I think most of us prefer to have 204 the way it is so I think we should leave it, try and pass it, and if it fails, then maybe come back and see if we can go for Senator DeCamp's compromise.

PRESIDENT: Senator Lamb. Oh, your light is off now, Senator Lamb? Senator Simon.

SENATOR SIMON: Mr. President, I would rise to oppose the