

issue, but they have come to an understanding and agreement that by chance that particular concept may be incorporated in such a fashion that it will still, ultimately, result in a much better slight gross, joint several, or comparative negligence kind of concept than what we have under current law. I think it also, by voting for the bracket motion, basically says that we won't trust this agreement. The only way that it is going to be to the floor that this is nothing but a deception and that LB 262 won't be voted to the floor so, therefore, there will not be a vehicle there. I happen to have faith in the individuals who said that there would be five votes to get that bill out and provide a form by which the inspection issue, all of the other "asundricus" issues that we have heard are lingering around. We'll have an opportunity, but we can keep LB 88 clean so that we can analyze it specifically and in so doing if, in fact, it doesn't pass muster on Select File by virtue of the amendments that will be offered at that time, one can make his decision at that point. But in the meantime, I think the bracket motion is nothing more than a stall technique for fear that this agreement that has been worked out inside the body may very well be one that is not an agreement that is deemed as being the most positive thing out on the...outside of the glass. So at this point I would rise in objection to the bracket motion. Let's forward LB 88 in the form that we've agreed upon. We still have Select File, we still have Final Reading to do any final touching and at that point if, in fact, it's time to move it off Select File, and 262 has not come out of committee, that would be the time to bracket it and say we've been a bit deceived, let's have the vehicle out there now to address that. So I strongly oppose the bracket motion and hope the body will agree with me on that.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Conway. We'll now proceed to Senator Ashford on the bracket motion.

SENATOR ASHFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just very briefly, reiterating what has already been said, three points. One is, LB 88 is...does deal with a very, very specific area of the law now. It deals with the issue of joint and several liability only. It has no other, nothing else on it. It is, and as I said at the beginning of this debate two or three days ago, that is all LB 88 is intended to deal with. Second point is that the senators involved in this debate have reached an accommodation so that the issue of immunities will be on the floor. I can see absolutely no reason why they have to absolutely track each