

within one vote of being killed. I think it had one person in support of advancement to the floor and that was Senator Kristensen. So the committee listened to both sides. They listened to LB 88. They listened to 262. LB 262 had a good hearing, a good fair hearing before the committee and there were four votes there to kill it. And I think, out of mercy, the committee chose to leave the bill in committee. And, for that reason, Senator Kristensen realizes his bill is not going to make it to the floor and so he's attempting to amend his version into Senator Ashford's bill. Now what exactly does my particular amendment do? It's a simple amendment. It says, Senator Kristensen, I like one particular part of your amendment. Senator Kristensen's bill has three different parts. One part deals with changing the negligence standard to comparative negligence, a standard that he says should be changed. It's what the fight has been over for the last nine years and probably before I got here they were talking about it. But it changes from the slight gross standard, which absolutely no one understands, to a comparative negligence where it says if that person is a little bit more negligent than the other person then he should have to pay. And that's what the law changes to. Now Senator Kristensen has essentially agreed to it. As I said, I'm keeping Section 3 of his particular amendment. That's all my amendment provides for. Now he has two additional parts to his amendment. One deals with joint and several and the other one deals with political subdivisions. Both of these changes in the law or both of these sections of his amendment change existing laws. All those terrible things he talked about, inspectors being liable for actions that they may have passed onto, their knowledge passing onto other people, that's the current law. If you don't like the current law, change it, but that's the law we've had for decades. Same thing with the joint and several. He wants to change existing law. So he has three sections to his amendment, mine says let's keep one, let's gut out LB 88 and just go straight with the comparative negligence. Now, it's kind of interesting because, as I said, 49 other states have gone to this particular change and I guess you ask yourself, why haven't we changed the law? And I have been here nine years and I haven't changed the law and I guess if you're going to cast blame on why a law passed in 1913 hasn't been changed, I guess the only one you can really blame is the membership in the body. And part of the reason that the law hasn't been changed is it's so confusing. Instead of just looking at it and saying...I will give you an example. Let's say Senator Bernice Labeledz is sitting up front there in