

what is clear is that the original philosophy was that these fees taken as a whole, the license fees, the learner's fees and the school permit fees were supposed to fund the operation or largely fund the operation of government operations related to those functions. So now with this shift what we are saying is that part of those functions are going to be supported by the general fund to the extent of better than \$700,000, and obviously, as we all know, when you cut off \$700,000, that is \$700,000 that has to be made up some place else. The correct solution from my point of view, there are two possible correct solutions. One of them would have been to raise the fees, and curiously enough in the other committee I am on, Public Works, we have a bill that is coming up to the floor to raise the fees. I don't know if that was worked out in conjunction with this bill or not, but for your information, you should know that that is on its way. The second solution, the second preferable solution from my point of view would be to start looking at driver's education in the two major cities, Omaha and Lincoln, and asking ourself the question, if this couldn't be done by private enterprise. Now we have been supplied with some figures today that say that government can do it three times more efficient than private enterprise and that to me is so ludicrous that it calls into the question the credibility of the entire set of figures. I can see no logical reason nor have I heard any argument why in the major cities as opposed to small towns where populations are dispersed, Lincoln and Omaha, why this whole thing could not possibly be done by the private enterprise system, by commercial schools. One argument you hear against that is that, "Well, not so many people will take the course then and we won't have everybody educated and acting in a properly safe manner by the time they learn to drive." But if that is what you believe will happen, then I think the proper alternative perhaps is to make an education course compulsory. After all if you really believe that these courses are so very effective, then shouldn't everybody have the course. Why should we allow people to choose to have the course or not have the course. Well, those are my basic ideas, I think some things you should throw around in your mind before you decide to vote in favor of a bill like this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, fellow colleagues, I rise to oppose LB 207 for two or three reasons. Number one, the fiscal impact is \$700,000 minimum this year. What is it going to be in future years? How are we going to make up the difference in the general fund? We are going to make it up by raising taxes somewhere along the line. And I feel that it is time that if they wish to have driver's