has indicated that the reduction of income flow will be about ten times that amount of money that we cut from the Department of Revenue. So the real truth will be that if we make this kind of a 3 percent reduction to the Department of Revenue, a $318,000 reduction to the Department of Revenue, we can realistically expect, by virtue of unaudited returns and uncompleted collections, a far more significant loss in our own revenue and I'm going to tell you some stories, true honest to gosh stories. Mike Dukakis is elected Governor of Massachusetts and Mike Dukakis faces a revenue crisis and he goes to his Revenue Commissioner and he says, I do not want to increase tax rates and I don't want to change the tax base. If I simply give you enforcement tools, how much more money can you collect? And the Commissioner of the Department of Revenue in Massachusetts goes to his audit people and he talks to the outside world and he goes back to Mike Dukakis and he says, well, I think with some enhanced tools we could probably enhance our collections by 10 percent. So the Governor says, all right, we will add to your appropriation, we will add to your appropriation and in addition we will impose some criminal sanctions on nonfilers and the like and we will start a real tax enforcement program. In the first year the State of Massachusetts collected $678 million of new money with no tax rate increase and no tax base change. It was a 13 percent improvement in their tax collections simply through enforcement. Now the Massachusetts experiment has gone on for four years now and they have discovered that each year, through enhanced enforcement techniques, they have improved their performance between 10 and 15 percent annually. So the Massachusetts model was then followed by Texas, by North Dakota and by California and by Arkansas. We now have experiences in five other states as to what a State Department of Revenue can do when they zero in on enforcement and collection and literally in every one of those states, in every one of those states their tax collections have gone up very, very significantly. Now, I guarantee to you, as our Tax Commissioner has done in her letter which I have had passed out and placed on your desk, her letter to me of October 17, 1985, if we turn the clock back and decrease our expenditures for the Department of Revenue, we are likely to see a reduction over time in terms of our tax collections. Now I'm going to tell you some horror stories. Ten years ago the Internal Revenue Service audited 2.6 percent of all individual income tax returns and that audit level is important to us because we piggyback the