

and it was a slipshod method for the state government to operate. And this hurt many, many people outside of the cities, out in the country, out on the farms, to lose your total farm income. It is, in my opinion, exactly the same thing, if the state is going to be the problem and the reason that Commonwealth folks lost their funds, then the state is the reason and the problem western Nebraska and the farmers lost their funds. So I cannot understand, and I have tried, to see why we should take state funds of everyone in the state and pay the Commonwealth depositors and yet there has been no attempt, no investigation to take care of the folks who lost their funds due to another state agency not doing their job. That's the reason I oppose this legislation. I feel that these folks have received...or are going to receive a total of \$12.5 million and that's exactly \$12.5 million more than the folks received who lost their funds when the elevators went broke. And, to end my discussion, Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of this body that every time you see an ad from a bank it says, FDIC insured, which stands for Federal Depository Insurance Corporation, not federal government, a corporation which is the same thing that was operating the American Charter, Commonwealth people. It was a corporation that was in charge and not the State of Nebraska. That has been legally proved. The courts say that we are not legally accountable for this. And those are the end of my remarks. Thank you, Mr. President. I withdraw my motion.

SPEAKER BARRETT: The motion is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Landis would move to return the bill.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Landis, please.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. And Senator Haberman having very clearly laid out his plan, I want to do two things. First, I want to explain what the provisions of the bill will do financially and how it rests at this juncture. This bill would require 33 votes for the bill to take effect within this fiscal year and you and I who have followed this issue know there aren't 33 votes on Commonwealth. What will happen then is the bill will be put up with the E clause. It will be voted upon. When there are not 33 votes, it will be voted on the second time. Now, what is the legal effect of voting and passing the measure with 25 votes? It's this. It's