

thank you, Senator Robak. A difficulty with this bill is its basic dishonesty, dishonesty in conception, dishonesty in presentation, dishonesty in drafting. I know that it's pointless, in most instances, for me to hand these articles around. But I want a record of the information that was made available to the senators. And there is an article in there showing that Omaha has gotten a judgment of over \$1 million against a fleeing driver and acknowledges that it will not be able to recover it because the person has no money. So why take a virtual zero and put it in this allocation formula, when all it can do is serve to reduce the amount of recovery that can actually be realized by the innocent third party? Again, if the driver is found to be 95 percent negligent and we're basing everything on a negligence standard, which is preposterous anyway, but it fits the nature of this bill, then that means 5 percent of the damage can be recovered because the driver is 95 percent negligent, the driver is judgment proof, so 5 percent is all that this innocent third party will get. Instead of our sitting here or standing here and watching Senator Maurstad scramble and dance around like a drop of water on a hot skillet, trying to convince us that there is some way we can make it unnecessary for the city to pay, while still compensating the innocent third party, we ought to just bring the whole charade to an end. Senator Vrtiska wants help from the Legislature for an entire county because of expenses that he says are not the fault of the county. And he wants some assistance from the state, which means all of the state's taxpayers will contribute to make that county whole, even though none of us has responsibility for what happened. Then we turn around in this instance where we have an identifiable, specific person with quantifiable injuries caused by an identifiable employee of a political subdivision, and suddenly we're saying that person should not get the compensation that has been available for over ten years. Why is this bill before us? Because Omaha has given the word that the chase rules are loosened. That's what Hal Daub has told these cops. They have more chases now. Because you won't read these articles, I'm going to mention one of them at least by date, so that anybody who wants to check the record...but it's on page 10 of that handout I gave you, with Roman Numeral I. The article is dated March 16, 1995, page 9, from the World-Herald, Chris Burback wrote it. This is a quote, "In 1993, there were 28 pursuits. Of the 1994 pursuits, 90 were initiated because of traffic offenses, 52 because of noncriminal activity, nontraffic criminal activity, and one because of a