

coming on this score to begin with. Now I support the move to strip the Landis-Peterson amendment. I would support an income criteria at much higher levels but what we are talking about here, we are breaking in and the amendment went to the elderly exemption and started at \$4,300. Now most of the people involved, and I wish everyone would listen to this, you have got people that we are bringing in that have lost the use of their arms. You have got people that have wheelchairs and most of the people involved have to alter their homes. These homes we are talking about giving more exemption to have been altered. They are given a different market status to begin with, and to go in with such low income status as this bill presently exists, I think would be a step backward in helping out the crippled people, the people that are handicapped. Because when they altered this home, they brought down the market to those where they would have a reasonable market of a few individuals like in the City of Lincoln that would be looking for wider doorways that wheelchairs could go back, maybe a sink that sets so that a wheel chair can come in under it, and a home that has been lowered in valuation because of the alterations for the average homebuyer. It has reduced its market potential. These people usually have high medical costs. You are talking about a single group of people with much higher than average medical cost, and to come in with income criteria where you start stripping away the exemption at \$4,300, when they have had to modify that home, when they have additional medical expenses hanging over them is totally unreasonable. I personally support the idea of income criteria on all these exemptions but the ones we placed on the bill are totally unreasonable because of the circumstances of those individuals that are handicapped. The special needs they have, the special medical costs that they incur, so at the present time with a very limited aspect of the bill as originally introduced, I think we should strip the amendments off and proceed with the bill, pass it in its original form and give some help to some really needy people. Now if the Legislature would care to look at it again, I think we could have a more thorough discussion of what income limitations would be realistic. As amended the present bill is a step backward in state law. Let's strip the amendments and pass the bill and help out some very needy people. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I am a veteran and a veteran of the Southeast Asia campaign, so I think that I probably have as much sympathy for the people who fought over there as any one here. I knew a