

effect, on a \$100,000 transaction the amount is a mere \$40. Is that correct?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If the bill, as Senator Haberman offered it, had been allowed to stand the increase would have been 90 cents rather than 40 cents, and the amount on a \$100,000 transaction would have been a mere \$90.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But you felt that that would be too big a burden on these people engaging in these hundreds of thousands of dollar transactions.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Senator Hefner is always soft on the rich, and it was his amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But did you support his amendment?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: To get the bill out of committee, I did.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And, Senator Johnson, was the rationale that the increase was too great, the percentage of increase?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Senator Hefner is always good at whatever rationale works.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'll ask Senator Hefner then. Senator Hefner, why were you opposed to the amount being increased from \$1.10 per \$1,000 of value to \$2.00? I'm asking...if you'd pay attention to the beast, rather than beauty, you could keep your mind on what I am asking you. (Laughter.) Now the question is, why were you opposed to the increase going from \$1.10 to \$2.00?

SENATOR HEFNER: It was a compromise of the committee members. We thought it is better to get a little than too much.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Who thought it was too much? You thought it was too much to put \$90 on these people who deal in these big transactions that you just told me about. It is getting the rich, yet here you are trying to protect them from a