

that are being addressed are consistent with what the court ordered and it does provide a distribution in a variety of areas, obviously, not totally satisfying any one because there wouldn't be sufficient funds to do that.

SENATOR HEFNER: Okay, thank you for the answer.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Schmit, followed by Senator Wesely.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, I, again, want to say this that I'm not trying to be critical of the committee. I think the Appropriations Committee, we recognize that we had to pass a bill because the Attorney General said that this money was distributed by court order and, therefore, the executive had the right to distribute the money and it was not a part of the legislative prerogative. So, although we can look at it and we can tussle with it and we can argue with it and we can discuss whether or not it is equitable, we really have nothing to say about it. That is my principal concern about the situation and it may be after the fact and it may be too late to do anything about it. But I think it is very unfortunate that this money, in plain language, was stolen from the people. It was stolen from the people by one of our major corporations, the Exxon Corporation. Now, normally when people commit theft they go to jail for it. I don't know what the situation was here. I doubt if anyone did any time for this theft of hundreds of millions of dollars. If Nebraska's share is twenty some million bucks, that's a substantial amount of money. My concern is this also, it probably only represents a small portion of the money that was actually stolen from the people. Let's say what it is, it's theft, plain, ordinary theft. One of the reasons why I think very strongly and feel very strongly that the money should be spent as much as possible for the benefit of the public is because it is impossible to redistribute the money in the same proportion that it was taken. Therefore, the second best alternative would be to try to send it back to the people on a general basis. Now, there is, I think, an even better alternative and that's been discussed some. I know the committee tried to address this when they talked about trying to send it back on the basis of need. It's bad enough to steal from anyone but it is reprehensible, ladies and gentlemen, to steal from the poor and those who can least afford it. If they steal from those of us who are more affluent, we can...it's not going to affect our lifestyle, it's not going to affect the manner in which we live or the clothing we wear or the food that