

the bill to satisfy that concern. It is...that's specifically in response to that point. I might make a little point about the Bar Association Committee. The Bar Association Committee was made up of both plaintiff's lawyers and defense lawyers and also lawyers...the Chairman of the committee, for example, Rick Spellman from Kutak-Rock I don't believe really is involved in this kind of litigation at all. So he was, for the most part, an objective chairman. It is not true that the Bar Association, I suppose, technically does not...they did not vote to endorse this legislation but 1178 had caused them some concerns technically and they voted not to support 1178. What they did is they adopted or accepted the changes brought to them by the Bar Association Committee and felt that that was a significant improvement to the bill. I think it's probably pretty appropriate that the Bar Association would take somewhat of a "neutral" position here. They're certainly not opposing LB 159. What they're saying is this is a change in our system. We have suggested to you some changes that will procedurally make this bill a better bill, in our opinion, and then it's up to you to make that decision. But we, as the Bar Association, are not opposed to it. And I think that's pretty significant. And when the Governor vetoed the bill, there was opposition by the Bar Association. In fact, there was rift in the Bar Association between the plaintiff's lawyers and the defense lawyers and that rift was basically mended as a result of the changes to LB 159. So in response to the concerns that Senator Pirsch is making, a radical change, not really. This is not really a radical change. Nebraska is the only state left, the only state left in the United States that has not adopted a form of comparative fault. Why do people adopt comparative fault legislation? They do it, not so it's easier for plaintiffs, not so it's easier for defendants, it's so it's easier for people, the population, the average citizen on the street, to understand the tort system. That's why we're doing this and that's why 49 other states have adopted this. The slight gross standard makes no sense. Senator Landis gave an example of a case where a plaintiff was not able to recover because of the slight gross standard. I will give you an example on the other side where juries may really like a plaintiff, really like a plaintiff and say, I really like this plaintiff and I don't care what the negligence of this plaintiff is, I'm going to find for this plaintiff and not only...and their three defendants, and not only am I going to find for the plaintiff, I'm going to find for the plaintiff in the amount of a million dollars and I'm going to require each one of those defendants to pay a million dollars...