

able to turn in your Journal to find it. This is an amendment that uses a...some provisions of a related subject that had a public hearing before the Judiciary Committee. And I checked with the members of the Judiciary Committee upon introducing it, to tell them and affirm with them that it was a measure that they endorsed in the committee. It was not reported out, however, because of the overwhelming workload of that committee. LB 656 aims a level of regulation at camp grounds, because there is a record of abuse in this area. On General File you'll recall that there were about 30 examples of abuse that have occurred, that we have documentation of in our Attorney General's office, of the way in which these sales practices or commercial transactions occurred. The Attorney General, at the same time as asking for this specific form of regulation set forth, also asked for adjustments in our Uniform Deceptive Trade Practices Act, which responds to this same general area, but not with respect to one individual industry, but for all commercial transactions. We have a series of prohibited acts which merchants may not enter into without running afoul of deceptive trade practices. And the Deceptive Trade Practices Act has a couple of different forms of enforcement. One of them is criminal, one of them is civil. One of the difficulties is, however, that our criminal statutes in the area are misdemeanors, by and large for the most part, and, secondly, that there is no way of aggregating the amount of damage so that the Attorney General can threaten a penalty sufficiently powerful to offset the inducement of profit that a deceptive practice may mean for a merchant. So, in the amendment, there are two changes. First, that the statute of limitation on the Unfair Deceptive Trade Practices Act, with respect to civil litigation, be raised from one year to four years. Our normal standard of statute of limitations for a contract case is four years; for a tort case is four years.. These are the standard statute of limitations for differences between consumers and merchants when there is some kind of claimed fraud in a contractual relationship. In other words, removing from the too tight standard that currently applies in the Attorney General's office to the normal standard for contractual problems, four years. The second change allows, on the civil side, for the Attorney General to request an administrative penalty to be issued by the court in those cases where the court finds deceptive trade practices have occurred. And that is a \$2,000 per violation administrative penalty. That can be requested by the AG's and it can be granted in the discretion of the court. Let me tell you the process that a merchant would go through, if