

much abuse now with the pickle law, and let me remind you and I want everybody to listen to this, when I abused the petition laws as determined by the courts, I was arrested. And if there are any abuse in the pickle law as it is today or it will be in the future, why isn't something being done about it? It seems to me that we keep saying that there are a few organizations and yet some tell me there is five or six, and if those five or six are still selling pickles, who should we blame for it? Is it the Department of Revenue? Is it 49 senators on this floor? Senator Hall has tried with his amendment to come up with some strong tools that will help the Department of Revenue. I say they have that opportunity now to stop the abuse that we have. I will never vote for an increase in the pickle tax or the cigarette tax. I am waiting now patiently until the Forecasting Board on Friday comes in and tells us. At the meeting I asked, can any senator tell me why we need an increase in the pickle tax? What's the purpose? Is the state going broke? Don't we have enough money to fund the programs that we have? Is it absolutely necessary that we have an increase in tax? You can recall a couple of years ago the present administration said, there will be no increase in tax, absolutely no increase in tax, but last year we raised the tobacco tax four cents per pack. This year we are asking for two or four cents more and we're also asking for an increase in the tax on pickles. A tax is a tax. This is not a fee. Regardless what you say or what you try to determine, when you increase a tax, it is an increase in tax and the fees...well, the fees I still consider a fee, Marge, but I'm sorry, this is definitely defined as a tax. I will vote for the amendment and get it over to Select File, but I'm sure on Select File I'll do everything I can to make sure that it's 12 percent of the definite profit which will bring it back to what it is now. Let me read you some figures that I got from the Department of Revenue. FY1986 to '87, they received \$3,270,000 in tax. For the first six months, or wait a minute, for the calendar year 1987, the calendar year, they received \$4,050,000 in tax. Now let me tell you what they've got in the first six months of this fiscal year.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR LABEDZ: From July 1, 1987, to 12-31-87, they've already received \$2.8 million. In the next six months it should be 5,617,500. If you double the first six months of this fiscal year, they should receive over five and a half million dollars. If we go to an increased tax, but we must keep in mind, I admit