

substantially more often individuals are hurt by automobiles, by farm machinery, by machinery in an office, by machinery in a manufacturing plant. I think we are doing the statutory scheme entirely backwards if we are putting in a higher level of statute of repose for this type of waste than we are for ordinary products in the stream of commerce that are injuring people and that we, as a matter of state policy right now, are saying, if that product is over ten years old, you can't recover. I think the least we can do to make ourselves consistent is to adopt the Hall amendment to say we are recognizing a ten-year scheme for everything, and since that is the policy decision that the body just made, as Senator Hall explained, overwhelmingly. So let's try to maintain some internal consistency and adopt the Hall amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Will. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: I will waive.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, Madam President, members of the body, I stand in opposition to the Hall amendment, not because I don't have some sympathy with what he is saying, and not because I, under ordinary circumstances, would have supported reducing to ten years, but because I felt that if we tried to incorporate the statute of repose wholesale on this bill, it would doom the bill, and I care about this bill. I think it is an important piece of legislation that we need to talk about and that we need to put into statute, and, therefore, even though I do have some sympathy with what he is trying to do, I am going to vote against the Hall amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Dierks.

SENATOR DIERKS: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. Senator Hall, it seems to me that your amendment is inconsistent with your philosophy on the previous amendment. And, I see, oh, you picked...I see, you've picked up a lot in the last twenty minutes, haven't you? But you mentioned something a little bit ago that I wonder if you really said what I thought you said, and that was that the forty-year statute of repose would not deal with people but with products, and yet you have stricken the part on line...line 19 that deals with people. Do you agree with that?