

A. An adjustment to place the matter in some form of equality. But I think we're all looking at something that isn't going to happen.

Q. Governor, do you have any speculation about the motivations of the Comptroller, as you put it, sniping at the tax program?

A. No, there are some people who say that having been sued once about a tax, the Comptroller was worried possibly about entertaining another personal suit and would like to clear up these matters. But it would seem to me that the Attorney General's opinion as to the constitutionality of the law should be sufficient to satisfy him. On the other hand, since he has publicly raised these issues and since there are people who would like to defeat the tax program at any cost, it's reasonable to expect that there will be suits filed. We might as well file a declaratory proceeding immediately to avoid the necessity for many other litigations throughout the courts.

Q. Will you comment as to whether, in trying finally to clear up once and for all this bill, we'll create a new nest of questions for the filing taxpayers?

A. Well, I don't think there's much question about the fact that that position is not a sound one. I would expect the Attorney General will, as long as he's filing such a declaratory action, reach into every possible attack that could be made on the bill.

Q. That would include corporate capital gains, sir?

A. This I leave entirely to his discretion as the State's chief legal officer. Since this has been raised, I would suspect that possibly this will be part of whatever action he'd file, and I do expect that his opinion will be that this contention is not a valid one, as I indicated before.

Q. Governor, on another topic, a real estate association here in Maryland this week suggested that there be a referendum to oppose your statewide open housing legislation that passed this year's General Assembly. Does this in any way discourage you?

A. No, it doesn't discourage me. I think it does prove one thing, that if this law is being taken to referendum, or suggested that it be taken to referendum, we were on very sound grounds in restricting the law in the way we did, because certainly a broader law would be subject to increasing attack by other organizations that have accepted this law. I was surprised that the real estate people waited so long to voice their objection to the law, but I don't think the matter will