

been adequately protected. We have caps for their protection. You might recall the insurance bills that we had a number of years ago where cities had problems getting adequate insurance coverage. At that time, we, in our wisdom, chose to give caps for their liability so that you wouldn't have a multimillion dollar judgment that you hear about in California or New York or New Jersey, we would cap them off so that if someone was injured that they would not get these huge multihundred million dollar judgments against cities and causing property taxes to go up as a result of that accident. We provided for some adequate compensation for individuals and I guess that was the best approach; the legislature, in its wisdom, chose to adopt that approach to protect political subdivisions and that is what we have. Now we have a second phase here. This is a bill that they have tried to bring in year after year after year and they couldn't get it passed by the legislature. So what did they do? They got some smart lobbyists out there and they said, well, you know, they have got this bill that is running down the railroad tracks and it is going to pass, LB 88. Lets add this on, since the bill is going to pass anyway, we will say we will just add this on and after it...as it moves along the track we won't argue against its advancement and eventual passage but they have to take this section as well. Well, they couldn't get it done. They couldn't get that amendment attached. They couldn't get the bill out of committee, for that matter, and now they are coming in and they are saying...they have told a number of people in this body that, you know, there are some flaws in that bill that we passed, LB 88, and those flaws will cause some problems in what our comparative negligent statutes are. Now I have no problems with them. I feel confident that if there are some problems that need to be worked out, the courts can adequately deal with those issues. But, I have a problem with this section they have added. That is the section that does not deal at all with the problem. It deals with inspections. Now what does inspections have to do with some technical amendments that need to be adopted by this legislature? Nothing. They don't have anything to do with it. But they see that this is a bill that might pass. They see something that they might be able to attach it to, so they have chosen to add inspections. Now, this isn't the only section they have added on here. We really didn't get an adequate description of what this amendment did. What we got was, we have to pass this bill in order for LB 88 to be properly enacted into law. Now another section that needs to be addressed, and that will come in the following amendment, deals with the road construction where an individual