I think he was saying I'm going to reconsider this remedy. My question to the body is, is it all right with us, is it acceptable with us to pass a legal rate, but knowing that the major paper in the state doesn't follow the legal rate, charges more than the legal rate, and that those transactions continue, that the City of Omaha and others use that newspaper, pay a rate greater than the legal amount, even though they are in the statute? Is it acceptable to this body to have the legal rate ignored, apparently with impunity, by the Omaha World-Herald and customers who are doing business with it contravention with this statute? Was that what reconsideration vote meant? For myself it did not mean that. It meant that another remedy needed to be fashioned, a different one than the criminalization. But I'm interested in knowing, kind of off the top of your heads, whether or not that is the situation that we find ourselves in. If I could, I'd like to just a few questions. I think I understand Senator Moore, because he's been explicit with that. I'd like to ask Senator Barrett a question in that case.

SENATOR BARRETT: Certainly.

SENATOR LANDIS: My question is, would you entertain a different form of remedy that would try to impose the legal rate for those who use the legal rate method as binding for those people who are making and publishing legal rates?

SENATOR BARRETT: Senator Landis, I will not give you a yes or no, I will give you a qualified yes and say I'd be glad to talk to you between now and Select File.

SENATOR LANDIS: That's good enough.

SENATOR BARRETT: That's as far as I'll go.

SENATOR LANDIS: I appreciate that. Senator Schimek, may I ask you a question?

PRESIDENT: Senator Schimek,...

SENATOR LANDIS: As one of the co-sponsors of the reconsideration motion, and I guess I can put this in a compound fashion, are you open to considering other alternatives besides the Haberman amendment or, in the alternative, are you satisfied with the current way things are operating with what we know to