

going to be taught during the school day but rather is going to be taught either in the summertime or on the weekends and, in fact, is going to be paid for by parents. So it became a voluntary paid-for program by parents. Now I assume still under this law, under the law as it presently exists, that even that program whenever a child took a voluntary driver's education program after school or what have you, the State of Nebraska still would have come in with its \$40. I have to assume that is the case though I don't know that...Senator Koch is shaking his head "yes". I don't know that for...Senator Koch says "yes" so it must be a fact, but the interesting thing that happened, the interesting thing that happened is that, you know, our school district was faced with a property tax limitation, and with faced with that, the school board had to make a choice, was this program one that should be cut or should be saved. Now what it did is it said we had better cut it as a traditional course offering but we still want to save it on a cash paid volitional basis. Now it seems to me that if we were to adopt LB 207 what we continue to do is we continue to encourage schools such as the Omaha School District to operate a program, not necessarily on a volitional basis, but on a regular part of the course offerings and that may not be a good thing to do at this time inasmuch as our school districts are really chafing under the taxpayer feelings about the property tax burden, which is very large, and in Omaha it is quite large for a variety of reasons. It may be better in the end if we do not lay any inducements, incentives or other factors on school boards to continue programs that could to some extent be secondary to academic programs. And it is for that reason that I am personally inclined to disfavor...not to support LB 207. It seems to me that the state continues to insist on a certain kind of a...I shouldn't say insist but to encourage, to encourage a certain kind of course offering notwithstanding some of the attitudes of the taxpayers that are out there and I would prefer almost to carry this program on without the heavy hand of the state involved. Secondly, one of the other things I dislike about 207 is the fact that it continues, in a stronger way, to earmark funds. It seems to me that one of the aspects...one of the traps that we have fallen into over the last few years with state government particularly is that we will impose a particular tax, such as on insurance companies, or we will levy a particular fee and then we will earmark revenues from that tax or that fee for a particular purpose. So as the tax is increased or the fee is increased, then so too do those revenues increase and the purpose continues to be paid for notwithstanding whether the need continues to exist or not. And I think in the terms of the 1980s and in terms of better government, we need to begin to de-earmark taxes and fees so that every program, every function