

and gone home for the year so there was no chance for an override. In the Governor's veto message I was somewhat disappointed in, in that it very simply read and I quote, "I have not been persuaded of the need for the change", signed, the Governor. They gave us very little direction in terms of what concerns she might have had. As we forwarded that concept, since that was the turn of the session, I reintroduced LB 1178 intact and it is now called LB 159. It had a public hearing. During that interim and since the Governor's veto, a few people fell off the bill and through the course of this debate today I think several people are going to explain why some people fell off the bill, why there has been a lot of misinformation on the situation and why we ended up in a bit of a stalled situation last year. Part of it was some confusion with respect to Nebraska Bar Association, where they stood on the bill. There is some amendments pending that I believe have been filed that we'll be discussing in a little bit that clarify any procedural techniques within the bill that the Nebraska Bar had and will, I believe, take them no longer out of a position of opposition because of the procedural entanglements. But as we proceed with the debate I hope we have a full and active debate because this piece of legislation really has never had that. We've had debates on procedural activities and on little cliques within the bill but we've never really debated the bill in terms of where we are and I hope as we proceed through that factor today we will get to that. I think we will also talk about some of the people who are out in the lobby who still do not like the bill and possibly some of the reasons why. We hear allegations made that are very simple and I think many of those people think that we are that simple that we are going to fall into the trap of someone saying, oh, this type of legislation would be more costly and to have any one of those people describe how it will be more costly, they run out of steam. It's just simple phrases that have knocked the bill. We have statements made that this bill may possibly create more litigation. There is no way under any legal theory and anyone who works in the business that can describe to you how we would have more litigation. Anytime there is a personal injury of consequence where if someone has suffered serious damage and someone is responsible for that damage, there is litigation now. That doesn't change. You've got to have more accidents to have more litigation. People have a tendency to use those simple phrases and, like I say, some of you I think maybe have caught on to them, but I think between now and Select, if you advance this bill I would like those people to step forward and explain how you have more litigation,