

I've got to say is, folks, that we just have to work together. And I am going to support Senator Hall's position, and hopefully I'm not wrong at this point. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Nelson. Senator Landis, followed by Senators Moore, Morrissey, Ashford, Beutler, Withem, Rogers, Schimek, Hefner, Kristensen, Schmit, and Lamb. Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Madam President, members of the Legislature. It's a pity that this debate is as seemingly boring as it is, because this is one of the higher quality debates that we've had on a public policy issue. Senator Hall has been quoting from MAPCO and he's been making some excellent points. Senator Warner has as well, Senator Withem has as well. And we've had actually a very reasoned exchange on a very difficult issue, no wonder it's hard to follow, and just a trifle boring. But I want you to...I want to try to draw an analogy with you on my perspective on this amendment that may help to revitalize the conversation. For seven years many of us brought to the Legislature a claim for assistance from the Commonwealth depositors. We did it year, after year, after year. Ultimately, we got some relief from the body. You were all gracious enough to vote for that package, and there was an audible sigh of relief from people like myself who had been fighting so long. As Senator Hall had, as Senator Schmit had, as Senator Labedz had, and many others. The Supreme Court took that bill and put it right over the center field fence. It was gone. Could have brought in a bill the next year, could have tried another one to redo that. But, in fact, frankly some of our colleagues came to those that were supporters and said, Dave, there's a point at which you're simply dealing in false hopes, and that would be a great tragedy. You've got to work within the realm of what's doable, because otherwise you're really extracting a set of hopes that can't be met, and that has its own tragic quality. You know those feelings, we've exchanged them. You've had those conversations with me, and I've heard those points. Now there is a difference of opinion here, a difference of legal opinion. But my point to you is this, this is much the same situation. We have the possibility of entertaining false hopes and allowing people to think that something is possible when it really isn't possible, if we are not careful. I read MAPCO and I acknowledge the distinctions that Senator Hall made, he quoted from the opinion and the sections that he quoted from or accurately reported, and what