

price morals. It reminds me of a story that a friend of mine told me when I first went into politics. He said, Loran, I think I'm an honest man, but I have to admit that no one ever offered me very much. I think that kind of sets the tone here a bit. If we have a moral obligation, is it more or less moral at \$10 million or \$20 million? I believe that Senator Vard Johnson, Senator Wesely and Senator Warner have outlined that this requires a combination of individuals to get together and reach an agreement. The depositors will take some losses. The state will take some loss. But on the floor of this Legislature every day we take action which causes losses for individuals, businesses, industry, and sometimes results in benefits. From the broad spectrum we say, well, that's the business of government. But I've said, and I said it to the Governor, I have said it to many of you, that the proposed money, for example, that is to go into the water management fund of \$2 million which has evaporated down from the \$40 million that we started out with a few years ago, is not significant enough to be of any value to us at this time. I propose that we sacrifice the \$2 million and put it where it will do us some immediate good. It will take five years, at \$2 million per year, to get to the \$10 million level that the water management fund can even look at a water development project. So why fool around with it? If we get the economy moving again, I'm going to come back here in five years and tap you for some real money. If we don't get it moving, it isn't going to make a bit of difference. It isn't going to make a bit of difference. It's not water development we're going to be looking for, it's going to be food, clothing and shelter. So what I'm saying...and I expect every other single agency to accept that same kind of attitude. If I'm going to give up 100 percent of the water management money, surely my friend, Senator Landis in Government, Senator Hoagland in Judiciary, others will find ways and means whereby they can make sacrifices also. I believe that we must recognize that if we are going to get the issue resolved we ought to do it now. There isn't any legislative district, I doubt even in Lincoln that if they were to vote, would vote in favor of the Commonwealth depositor. Because when you spread the 7,000 depositors across the Lincoln districts, if they were all from Lincoln, you wouldn't have a majority. It is not the nature of man to be overly generous. But I do believe there is responsibility. I believe there is a moral responsibility. I believe we're going to have to look at it from that standpoint. On that basis I must vote against