

The Senate Bill 11 (the universal voucher bill) sponsor extolls the virtues of taking funds away from the public common school system to fund vouchers.

In a Guest Column published in an online version of The Columbus Dispatch, the sponsor of SB11 supports the perception that parents and students deserve the choice of a private education at public expense. The gist of the sponsor's thought process is that public schools are well-funded ("The Ohio taxpayer has done a fantastic job in making sure that our schools are funded"); that public schools will not lose funds as a consequence of SB11; that school privatization is a national movement; that two-thirds of property tax dollars go to public schools and; "Why can't parents spend their tax dollars at the school they choose for their children".

Possibly the sponsor is not aware that the Cupp/Patterson Fair School Funding Plan has been only partially funded and that the system was (and still is) ruled unconstitutional 26 years ago.

Just maybe the sponsor is not aware that the voucher funds are taken from the same state budget line items that funds school districts.

The fact that two-thirds of local tax money goes to school districts has no relevance to the voucher issue. Neither is the fact that voucher advocacy is nationwide relevant to the Ohio issue.

The notion that a person's tax payment belongs to him/her after the tax payments are made is a most interesting, revolutionary idea. So the tax one pays does not belong to the government to use for the common good. It really belongs to the taxpayer for a "private benefit" of the taxpayers choosing. Why not cut out the middleman (government) and have the parents pay for the education of their own children?