

March 22, 1974

committed to the point of doing what all of us want to do. And the only difference is whether we want to give more or less to a family of three or four, in a matter in which we really are not talking about that much money. And if you really want security for these people, as I'm sure we all do. I would think that would be the practical thing to do and I don't care who gets credit for this bill. I don't think it makes any difference. I don't think anybody outside of this room knows what we do anything, and who has the responsibility or the credit for whatever we do, and that's a very fortunate thing most of the time. Now I'm not concerned about what the people think because the only people who think in this matter are the people in this body. And then we talk about the people, we really don't know what we say because they don't have any idea what we are doing. And they understand eventually if we raise the lower the sales and the income tax. That's the thing we all have to stand up and face, including the Governor of this state. So in order to determine whether we really want to do what I think we like to do, but won't do it because we feel that we can override a veto. That's the purpose of this amendment. I think most everybody would realize and accept that these people ought to get at least this much. 90% of the poverty level. So I move for the adoption of the amendment and ask for a roll call vote.

PRESIDENT: Stand by. Senator Chambers. Then Stahmer, then Marsh.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, again I speak in opposition to this or any other amendment to this bill. I have tried to gets the amounts of money that I thought children needed to be properly cared for, but I found out that I could not be obtained in this body. I found that the Legislature is not going to vote for any proposition that is not giving a stated dollar amount. Senator Carpenter's proposal offers what could be called a sliding scale, and would provide the excuse needed for people to vote against the bill, by saying they have no way of knowing from time to time what an agency of the federal government might determine to be the poverty level. Therefore, they wouldn't know what 90% of that amount would be. From actions by Mr. Nixon, we see that there could possible arise a situation where an Office of Economic Opportunity would not even exist. There would be no agency by that name to determine a poverty level. I think that we ought to do, is take the bill as it is because we know how this Legislature is going to function and the type of bill is likely to be accepted. If this were 11 days into the session instead of coming with only 11 days left there might be time to explore that kind of possibilities that Senator Carpenter is talking about. We don't have the time now, we must do something. I donot believe, and I've been mistaken before by attributint too much good will or good sense to the Governor. But I do not believe there is enough difference between this bill and the one he proposed to justify him in vetoing this bill. He's capable of anything, I understand. But I don't think in this election year, with the things he has said about the need for increases in ADC, with the criticisms that he made specifically of Senator Marvel and the Budget Committee of the Legislature, and all of us as a whole. I don't think he would veto this bill when it can be said that it was hastened