

an individual could be a millionaire, not likely, but possible, and if their other income did not meet the requirements or met those requirements of 15,000 or less, they would receive this credit for the elderly. I don't think that is fair. I don't think it is a good proposal. I don't think it is a good plan. We did not do that. This is something that was done at the federal level, but I don't think we should complicate the issue by endorsing it, adopting it, and doubling it in our tax policy. I would like to strike the provision altogether as it currently exists, the 50 percent that is currently on the books, because what it does is exactly what others have alluded to, it purports to help the poor elderly. In many cases it does, but it does not to any substantive extent. It is, basically, window dressing, and it allows for us to say that we do help the low-income elderly, but \$200,000 does not go very far when you are dealing with folks who have an income of \$15,000 or less. My parents would qualify for this under the current statutes as they exist. My mom and dad raised 15 kids, and my father's income was never \$15,000 when he was raising us. I remember at Christmas somebody from the church brought over a basket and my dad bodily threw the guy off the porch saying, give it to somebody who needs it. I mean this is not something that is very well thought out. I don't blame the Governor because it is a federal program, basically. It is not structured well. We should strike this from the statutes altogether, and to double it at this point, I think, complicates things. Many of these people who qualify do not even file an income tax form. They do not even file income tax because we exempt them out with the \$10,400. They don't have to file federally. They don't have to file state. They don't get it. The people who are fairly conscientious, fairly intelligent, have a little bit of income and understand the rules, they get it, and I am not saying that they possibly can't use it, but in many cases, they don't need it. In many cases, they just happen to understand the rules, and in many cases, they could be much wealthier than the young folks who pay the bills in a lot of cases. I would urge the body to seriously discuss this amendment because I think that it is substantive tax policy change. I don't think it is good tax policy. It doesn't amount to a hill of beans in terms of money. You can just vote it down and say, oh, you know, forget about it. It is only \$200,000, but it is a serious issue. I would urge the adoption of this amendment to strike this provision from the bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Discussion of the Hall amendment.