

and a little bit too half-baked for me to feel comfortable at all, and so I would urge the body to defeat the amendment at this point.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Madam President, members, if I could ask...I don't need if I need to ask Senator Pedersen or Senator Withem or whoever might know.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Pedersen.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Senator Pedersen.

SENATOR PEDERSEN: Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: What is the, in the first section, Section 8, of your amendment, what is the purpose in having the party named as a party defendant?

SENATOR PEDERSEN: Pardon me?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Why is the, in the amendment, Section 8, on lines 2 through 6 of your amendment, why is the state being named a party defendant? The second part of your amendment says that reimbursing for cost.

SENATOR PEDERSEN: Well because the state would take up, take part of the liability with this.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Okay. So you're...it's your intent, I guess, to have the state respond, if there is damages awarded, the state would cover at least some portion of those damages?

SENATOR PEDERSEN: Fifty percent, yes.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you. I have a concern with that first part of that amendment and that is that the state be named a party defendant. I think there's two concepts that can be looked at in this amendment. One is the state paying half the cost of the defense of the case and I can see that. I think there may be some wise choice there. But I question whether we ought to be having the state being named as the party defendant, mandatorily being named as the party defendant in each case that's filed. It might make more sense to give, if the purpose