

want a successor institution you have to start at 20.5. Secondly, depositors are entitled to know where they stand. The difficulty of separating the 8.5 from the rest of the figure is that you get two tracks going and it puts the receiver in a difficult position. Does he sign the 8.5 settlement or not? If he signs it, it forecloses the depositors from suing. If he doesn't sign it and waits for some second track to run along, the other part of the claim, it just keeps giving more and more string to dangle out there and a longer and longer time before the depositors have a sense of where they are. We owe them better than that. We owe them an answer, and if this body is going to say, no, we're not going to fund this, then let's do it. If this body is going to say, yes, then let's do it, but let's not string out indefinitely the ability to give a straight stand-up answer to the depositors demands. Third, this increases a budget that we all know to be very, very difficult by \$8.5 million. It's not related to the bond. It's not related to the other mechanisms that can piece this out over time. It simply will trigger a tax increase, in my expectation, given how tight things are otherwise. Those three reasons again, you can't resurrect an institution with this amount of money. Secondly, the depositors need to know and deserve to know what we're going to do. To divide the question is to string things out and we shouldn't do that. And third, this is an \$8.5 million increase in our existing budget and probably triggers the tax rate increase that none of us want. There may be many other things that so trigger a tax rate increase, but I'd rather not have it be the DeCamp amendment to 713. I'm going to vote against the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Barrett, I have you on the list. Do you wish to speak at this time?

SENATOR BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. President and members, apparently there is a question in some of your minds about the DeCamp amendment. As I understand it, the request AM 1328 is an \$8.5 million appropriation right out of the general fund for purposes of settlement. It's a one year shot from the general fund that those proceeds will then go to the receiver at which point he can use, the receiver can use those funds to reorganize, to make a pro rata distribution of that money or whatever the case may be. It would eliminate the provisions involving the State Office Building, the cigarette tax and so forth, again, a straight