

of taxation as this move, but I do want to compliment the Appropriations Committee on one facet of this move. It is not as bad as the original Governor's request to shift eight million dollars of the highway trust fund to fund the state patrol. I see no rationale, no reason whatsoever that we have to make little moves like this looking for \$4,875,000 on regressive tax to try to put together a funding package when the general revenue system is adequate to take care of it. There just isn't a good reason except for the Governor's commitment to holding line on the income tax, which of course would be a nice idea if it was practical to do it. But, to go to that measure of shifting this tax, again and again we have it in the appropriations bill and revenue measures from a generally progressive system to regressive forms of taxation to make the little people pay a bigger part of the package. From July 1, 1982 to July 1, 1983 the one million dollar tax payer is getting over a \$190,000 relief package by the federal income tax cut. Now instead of tapping for the wealthiest of this state pay according to their ability to pay, we are making moves to make every citizen, regardless of their ability to pay \$3.75 more if they own and license a vehicle. I think it is disgusting to see these moves go to regressive taxation. I think this body ought to look at it seriously. Are we going to bail out the million dollar tax payer from taking an increase and maybe getting back a little bit of that \$190,000 relief that they get out of the federal reduction and then turn it over to a regressive tax. I urge this body to look at this in the general terminology and let's go up front and put it back on the general revenue system like it has historically been and keep it there. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, if you vote for this I want to say in advance, congratulations, you are doing exactly what the public expects us to do. They expect us to gouge them when we can. If we keep this \$3.75 on that is what we are going to do. We are going to give them something for nothing and it is going to cost them \$3.75 and they are going to say, that is what we expected from the Legislature. I can not go along with charging them an extra \$3.75 for nothing. Now I have to agree that if you are going to raise the tax, you need 4 point million or five million dollars, let's do it by raising it or by cutting the budget. Let's don't hoodwink or try to hoodwink