

Senators who have to talk to urban Senators about supporting bills that relate to the problems of farmers. We have a situation where city people brought a claim that some of the farm Senators don't like so they are going to change the makeup of the Claims Board and still say that these urban Senators are so dumb that they are not going to be able to see the fast shuffle being worked on them, that they cannot put these issues together and see the totality of the picture, that the farm Senators will say let me take and take and take but I'll give, give, give nothing in return. And I know that there are a lot of issues that go into the making of a political decision in the Legislature and all of our decisions are political but there is such a thing as fairness and equity. But if those words stick in the craw of the legislators, then we can talk about a quid pro quo. Let us trade. If you want something for the farmer, then don't take something away from everybody else. And I am going to watch the unfolding of this drama. Then I am going to listen carefully the next time they talk about farm issues, about how these poor people are losing their farms, they can't pay their debts, the state ought to do this, the state ought to do that, but then we are going to make the state immune to claims from other people who have legitimate claims through the playing of a cheap, paltry, political game. The state would be better off were I a benevolent dictator with absolute authority to rule by fiat. This state would take off like a jet plane toward social justice, equality, and fairness for all persons. But since the citizens are not wise enough to allow that to happen, we will just have to stumble along and do the best we can in an imperfect world, but I hope we won't add to that imperfection in the state machinery of government by adopting the bill as it was introduced. My amendment is designed to mitigate somewhat the damage that will be done by this political move. Put these two other people on it who may at sometime be the cause of a claim against the state. You all remember how the Auditor fired an individual. He took the case to court and won and he was upset because the Auditor was not properly conducting audits of the Governor's Office. Now suppose a claim arose because of something the Auditor did, then we are going to have to come back in here and say take the Auditor off the Claims Board or he cannot be allowed to vote because of a conflict of interest. Are you saying that a unanimous vote of the board members or a unanimous vote of those who are allowed to vote who don't have a conflict of interest? This is a