

majority of those present can vote for the issuance, for example, of millions and millions of dollars of bonds. Now if that is the kind of procedure that you want, you don't have to have the amendment. But I think it is better public policy on any board that has this kind of power to require that a majority of those elected or those appointed, whatever the case may be, that they are the ones that should have the power to act and that a minority should never have the power, for example, to issue a large amount of bonds. It gives public officials, for an example, an opportunity to escape responsibility, simply fail to show up at a meeting and let your buddies vote for the issuance of all the bonds. That is just one pernicious effect of having that kind of law I think. But first of all, I just believe that the majority should rule. So it needs to be changed for that very important purpose. Secondly, it needs to be changed because it does away with the public bidding on the sale of the bonds. Now I can tell you from experience that by and large the governing boards of political subdivisions do not understand very well bonds, how brokers...the three or four different ways the brokers can make money off the sales of bonds. How many of you know what it means to sell on that par and realize that brokers can make money again by selling them at something other than par and then pocketing the difference between the sale price and the par value? It gets very complicated, but one good way that city officials and county officials have of understanding that situation is when they have three or four brokers coming and saying, hey, that guy is ripping you off here, you should understand this. And then they can get a response and go back to the other guy and they can say, that's not true our deal is better because of this and an understanding develops of exactly what it is they are doing and how much it costs them in terms of the interest rate, in terms of the payment to the broker for the sale of the bonds, in terms of attorney fees that they pay. If you have competitive bidding, you get that. If you don't have competitive bidding, you get the situation that we have in so many areas in Nebraska where turf is set aside, Chiles Heider is dealing with a certain town and it becomes very bad form for another broker to go to that town and try to hustle the business. Now that is not entirely true. It is very competitive in some areas but that tends to be the kind of development. I don't think that is a particularly healthy development. So I think we should not move in the direction of private sales but as a minimum retain the law the way it is rather than loosening the law. I think I will stop at that. The other two parts of the amendment are not nearly as important as those two, but I think that those two are worth returning it