

I think those of us who want the safety to continue and those of you who did not last year have a moral obligation that if we need money to carry on the noble profession of the state patrol the most appropriate place to get it is from the gasoline tax in the highway trust fund. I agree with Senator Johnson totally that the gasoline monies, the tax that come from that comes from all different sources, people who drive across the state and uses the bridge, who buy gasoline, pay the tax. So they also help control to the business of highway, its patrolling and the safety that is provided by that state patrol. We all know that if we continue to charge a surtax for \$3.75, even though it may be sunset a year or so from now, the odds are that it will not sunset, we will become so dependent upon it that we will maintain it again and again and again, just like we have always wanted to wipe the tax out on food. But the reason we don't is because cities and the state make money on food tax. Once you have established something as a moment of comfort probably will not be repealed. I don't know how you feel but I am going to state this and I'm going to state it one more time. That \$3.75 ought to go with the motor vehicle inspection bill and it be repealed. If it isn't repealed then we ought to, we ought to keep the motor vehicle inspection law. Otherwise take it away and for one year or so take it out of the highway fund for the financing of the state patrol. I hope that this body will act in good faith, because if you don't act on this amendment in positive fashion, what you are saying is yes, we did away with the motor vehicle inspection law, but guess what. You are still going to pay \$3.75 because we now need dollars and we are going to take it from each of you, the rich, the poor, it doesn't make any difference, you are going to get there and you are going to help us. Gasoline tax as you know is paid mainly by those of us who can drive our cars great distances or use them a great deal. People who are older and live on fixed incomes naturally do not have that money and drive sparingly. So therefore, those of us who can afford it can support it, those who can't shouldn't be forced to pay a surtax when usually cars they drive within the villages or cities in which they live and that is no great distance. I support the Landis and Fenger amendment and I hope you do the same.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, first I wonder if Senator Fenger would answer a question. Senator Fenger, I was wondering in order to clarify my own thinking on Senator Landis' amendment, did you have something in mind to provide the money if you were successful with your original amendment to be roughly 4.9 million that we would have to find someplace?