

to introduce, to with to have a consolidated standard of need and its aged, blind and disabled program. Now it is inconsistent that they would oppose LB 35 and ask for a piece of legislation. But all I can say is that in-as-much as they indicated that they wanted a piece of legislation in the area, it indicates to me that they really ought to have supported LB 35.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. That I think seals the situation as far as I am concerned. I think that this is the right concept. I think that the amendments have toned down the bill as originally introduced into a form that is reasonable, one that we can all accept and live with, one that is not as expensive as has been indicated and I certainly urge your support for the bill and I see no point in supporting Senator Haberman's motion to return that bill to committee. There is no need for that.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Murphy, do you wish to be recognized?

SENATOR MURPHY: Yes, Mr. Speaker and if I may a question of Senator Johnson.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Johnson.

SENATOR JOHNSON: Yes, Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY: I'm one of the admirer's of Senator Johnson who attended Yale and when he graduated he took a hard left and came back to Nebraska. Or maybe he took a hard left while there. But whatever.....I am a little curious as to why you designate your asking the state to create these forms and yet you designate that in your definitions that the standards of poor shall be a 125% of what our beneficent and omnipotent federal government says is poor. Evidentially we have poor in Washington ala their decision and poor in Nebraska according to whoever makes the study. I'm curious as to why you require a 125% rather than that designation that would apply nationally.

SENATOR JOHNSON: Yes, that is a very good question Senator Murphy. One of the things that I have truly appreciated in working with you and I mean this very sincerely is the fact that you have given a lot of attention to bills and you do ask very thoughtful questions. Now the amendment, the amendment that I have, which we might get to, will delete the reference to poor persons. The reason why it will do that is because a committee amendment which this body has already approved has deleted Section 7 of my bill which contain the only reference to poor persons. So once you delete that reference you might as well delete the definition of poor persons. The reason that I had a definition of poor persons to begin with is that it was my opinion, it was my opinion which I think certain economist have, of have basically sustained, and that is from which I draw