

January 31, 1974

SENATOR CARPENTER: No, I only wanted to take the opportunity, which I've already done of telling there's an alternate to the bill which would strike -the 90 and insert the 100% of actual value. So in order to do what I think the Chair wants to do, I move that we make this a day certain, Tuesday of next week. And then I will see that the Fiscal Note by our staff and I hope as well as the Governor's is on our desks.

PRESIDENT: Well we have the Fiscal Note from our staff, Senator Carpenter. The only Fiscal Note that we need apparently is from the Governor's Office in order to debate this at a time certain then and done under the motion of the Legislature.

SENATOR CARPENTER: For example, the staff's is there. Now the Governor may say it's going to cost seven million, and I don't want -to put this body in that position. We've adopted a motion and I think in every case without any exceptions those A Bills are important, and I'd be the last one who wanted to discontinue, and I'd be the last one who did anything who would cause their discontinuance. And I don't know what he's done, I've never talked to the Governor about this bill and I didn't talk to him about the other one, so I just wanted the people to understand what's there so I renew my motion day certain Tuesday.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Murhpy, do you have further imput here, he's asked this bill be bracketed until Tuesday of next week.

SENATOR MURPHY: A question if I may, Senator Carpenter.

PRESIDENT: All right. Senator Murphy has a question.

SENATOR MURPHY: You touched briefly on the position that in certain instances we would be helping the greedy rather than the needy certainly this bill carries a great deal of merit.' However there are many as you say, extremely wealthy people with investments that are not taxable, but do not appear on the taxable income statement at all. Has any method or attempt been made to separate the weak from the chaff in this case.

SENATOR CARPENTER: Not to my knowledge, but from the experience I've had in the field of taxation I think to do that would be impossible and we couldn't probably do it legally anyway. That was what was wrong with the bill in the first place. When we first introduced it, is that we set a minimum incidentally of illustration of \$250 for the constitution is very rigid that this thing had to be equitable and they had to be uniform. And so that's the reason we had to change the bill at the end of last session to do that. And when you start discriminating between people and you treat some people unlike others in the like position we get in trouble from a legal standpoint. I would think the only safe thing to do to make the bill legally sound and to eliminate any possibility, people like Senator Carpenter might be able there and he might do it to get the advantage which he not entitled to. I don't think anybody wants to do that or permit me to do it if that should happen. I think the only safe thing to do is to raise the 90 to 100. We've got experience there and leave the bill like it is. And I don't think you can do, Senator Murphy what you are indicating and have the bill hold water, legal water.

PRESIDENT: Senator Murphy, is that it? All right then, Senator Carpenter is asking unanimous consent to Bracket 613 on General File until next Tuesday. And of course pending the receipt of