

12.5 or whatever the number is, and even if the body passes it under a miscellaneous claims thing, I don't believe an honest court can approve it any more than we could approve any other group coming in here and simply saying we want money from you, just give it to us, because that's the theory of a miscellaneous claim. You've already settled and wiped yourself out of your tort liability argument once you do the tort liability so you can't hang onto that. It's just money granted. Now I still say there is a way to do it under public purpose, but obviously that's been rejected, rejected repeatedly by the Governor and others and I'm not going to push it anymore. In fact the bill in that theory was killed in committee. If you turn around after you've got your 8.5 million and you give away 6 million or 5 million or whatever the number is, don't tell me you've solved the Commonwealth problem. Now remember what the position of a lot of members of this Legislature is who have been working to get a solution. The position is that we have a roughly 90 percent of our constituents opposed. I've got a poll. You can look at it in my office. The sheets are there. 1,700 replies, 90 percent right on the button, do nothing on Commonwealth, and you can look at the questions, see how it's worded. It's worded as honest and simple as you can get it, should anything be done to help the Commonwealth? Resolve that issue. I'm still willing to try to do something but it's got to be done in the context of all working together which gets us to the arguments of Senator Beutler. I'm not saying there is blame, guilt. As long as we keep hanging on that like we did for the first 14 or 15 months, we go nowhere. There is a problem and a solution. I'm trying to make sure the solution gets the maximum effect. The Attorney General, and properly I believe, said your method is unconstitutional. I change the method with this amendment. All the amendment does, it says 85 percent of the Commonwealth people would have to approve of this first as part of their settlement. Why 85 percent? Because that's in the law already. That's the number required to reorganize the institution to do anything. That's the law. So Senator Lundy's argument about the other 15 percent, that issue was settled long ago. That issue is over. Senator Lundy's argument about this impairs the right to contract. His own Attorney General's Opinion addressed that. You can read it. It says, absolutely not. It has a couple pages. It says such bondholders would have no contractual right to repayment of taxes. It just makes it abundantly clear. I don't know the outcome of the