

So we are still not meeting much more than half the costs. Senator Cullan yesterday gave a dramatic, stirring, emotional talk on one of his pets which I supported and believe in and that is earmarking certain syntax for the research in cancer and heart related diseases, and he was so dramatic and emotional that he was able to stir this body to 26 votes, mine being one of those. So one more time Senator Cullan, it's nice for him to step on someone else's turf, but since I am Chairman of the Education Committee I am going to have to defend that committee's decision and the decision of this body not too many months ago where we said to the public schools, if you provide Driver's Education, we are going to try to refund you at least half the cost in carrying on that program. So, therefore, I don't believe that we should be subsidizing general funds from an earmarked source that we here in the Legislature passed last April and use it that way. It is earmarked for Driver's Education and any excess funds from that are to go to general fund so let's live with that decision. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President and members, I, too, rise to oppose Senator Stoney's amendment for basically the same reasons that Senator Koch just enumerated. Again, as most of you recall, we did increase the license charges that we charged the people of this state specifically for this purpose, specifically for Driver's Education. Now under Senator Stoney's amendment what we are going to be telling them is, sorry folks we increased those license fees but it is going to go to the general fund. At the same time, at the same time, those school districts that are providing Driver's Education and whether or not that is a good idea is a completely separate issue, that decision is made by the local school boards, and those programs are there, the school boards have planned on the funds that we told them we were going to send them, now suddenly we don't send them those funds, guess who pays the difference...guess who pays the difference. Well, obviously, it's the property taxpayer. It's going to have to go right back on the property taxpayer to make up for those differences that we are not going to send down to the local schools. So we go back to the age old argument of whether or not we should return some of the peoples' monies back to them, whether or not education should be financed at least partially by the sales income tax, or whether it should be financed more and more by the property taxes. The decision is very clear it seems to me, that we have made the commitment to send those dollars back to those people for them to use as they see fit for this area...in this area based on a use tax and I think we