

February 11th agenda LB 262 is on the second page, and the bill, itself, LB 262, I think we'll probably get to in the near future and we will have an opportunity at that particular time to examine whether or not we want to change the laws when it comes to the issue of inspections for municipalities, and probably at the same time, other amendments that members in the body will seek to add to LB 262 to put it in a form that they view acceptable. The Judiciary Committee listened to a lot of different discussion on what is the best approach in dealing with the changing of our negligence laws, and at the time, the committee, itself, decided...nearly decided to kill LB 262, had a change of heart, voted LB 262 onto the floor of the Legislature to be considered this session. I feel that this particular proposal is very near to being discussed by this body. It is always difficult with over 800 bills to coordinate, if you want to try to coordinate two different pieces of legislation, because there is just so many bills that are dropped in the hopper at the same time, and depending on when the committee brings those bills out, you never really know when those bills are going to come up. But a lot of what we have discussed that is in LB 262 has been discussed in LB 88; complete removal of political subdivisions from the change in the comparative negligence law, as well as a number of the issues, collateral source, joint and several liability, which has been added to the bill. A lot of the issues that you've heard discussed among lobbyists that need to be added to the bill have been discussed with this bill. Some of them have been added into the bill, some have been rejected by the body. I don't think this bill has really taken all that much time, and if you will note, there is only one other amendment that is up before the body, and that is a compromise amendment that...a compromise that was worked out in hopes that the body would not spend a lot of time on this bill. Now the bill is always and the amendment is always open to discussion, but I think the parties have tried to work on the bill so that it would not take a lot of time out of the body's consideration of other legislation. And I feel that if this bracket motion that Senator Elroy Hefner has offered here today was removed and we had an opportunity to vote on the amendment that is following, we could probably move this bill before eleven-thirty. I don't think time is really an element. I think it is an attempt on the part of Senator Hefner, who has not supported LB 88, who will not support LB 88, who has supported amendments that would cripple LB 88, to indefinitely postpone LB 88. And for that particular reason, I don't believe that this bracket motion is