

even though I raised questions a number of times, that when I met with roadblocks I did not try to go around those roadblocks as vigorously as I should have, partly because of the vehemence with which certain individuals were defended. Add to these scandals, the explosive problems surrounding the failure of the Franklin Credit Union and related matters. While some may assume that the Franklin case is a dead issue, both the money trail and the victim trail threaten to blow sky high again, leaving this legislative body with egg on our faces. At what point do we as legislators become coconspirators to scandals such as these? A government that is capricious and cannot be trusted to live up to its word, a government that will arbitrarily figure out ways to avoid paying one obligation so as to fund pet projects is a government that citizens will ultimately lose faith in. Worse than that, is a government which having established that policy and that precedent will repeat it again and again and again. It is for these reasons that I must introduce an amendment to LB 850 in an attempt to begin to right these wrongs which have been perpetrated against so many citizens. We must not allow ourselves to be complacent when entrusted with the power to address the wrongs suffered by the citizens of this state. All of you have seen a copy of the tort claim. All of you have had the opportunity to study it in detail. I could go into great detail page by page, line by line, but I'm going to do so only with several items, several items where I think the state has demonstrated liability. Number one, page 16 of the tort claim, Mr. Barry Lake was one of the early receivers appointed by the court to oversee the sale of certain properties, was selling certain lots for an average price of \$12,500 each with the approval of the court. At one point he had an agreement to sell a specific lot and the instrument number is documented, 86-12585. He had a specific authority to sell that lot for \$14,500. One day after he had received the permission from the court to sell these lots, he was discharged as receiver and others took over. Two years, approximately two years later that specific lot was sold for \$1,000, ladies and gentlemen, an onshore lot for \$1,000. The lots that Mr. Lake was selling for an average of \$12,500 were subsequently sold for an average of \$4,500 and \$49 per lot several years later. Remember this. After the market had strengthened, after interest rates had declined and after business as usual, supposedly it was getting on with itself. It's kind of interesting also that there were 20 lots that had not been sold on September 14, 1989.