

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 5, 2003 LB 131

depositors who was denied the ability to live in retirement with comfort because of the loss of all those funds? And my response to him was, I don't...you know, we really did everything we could do at the time. Those of us, particularly, in Lincoln worked very, very hard and diligently to try to save those funds for those people. And eventually what we did here on this floor ended up in court, and eventually the court said, no, you can't do that. And I think I convinced this gentleman...and he was very nice...that we really did deserve a raise. But he was wanting me to speak out more about Commonwealth. And I guess the purpose of my rising to talk about this is, I agree with Senator Landis, it was probably the worst public policy this state ever had. It really did deceive people. And Senator Landis, I want to ask you a question. I think I heard your response. But my question is, there is no way in the whole world that anything can ever be done for this depositors, correct? Is that what you're telling us?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Yeah. In my opinion, that's right. And certainly there's nothing that could be done with the...either the existence of this statute, or not...or without the existence of this statute, with respect to the NDIGC. There is no asset base there.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I do understand that.

SENATOR LANDIS: But with respect to the question you asked me, I do not know of a legal theory that has an ounce of likelihood of advancing.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Even though there is a different court now than there was then?

SENATOR LANDIS: I can't foresee it.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Okay. And are we sending any kind of a negative message here to Commonwealth depositors? Or are we just sending a realistic message? I guess, Senator Landis, maybe you want to answer that?