

have in this amendment which was in the other one was the sinking fund portion of that. If there are any questions, I would be glad to ask (sic) them. Rather than go through the whole spiel I made on 1114, it amounts to the same thing, except for the exception of the building fund portion. So, with that, Mr. President, I am open for questions.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: You've heard the opening on the amendment. Senator Warner, you're recognized to speak on the amendment, followed by Senators Kristensen and Robinson.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'd rise to support because this is consistent with LB 1114, where the amendment, I think they may need some clarification, but I'll refer to Senator Kristensen the balance of my time.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the Legislature, and thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Janssen, if I can, so we can just clarify some of these issues. And I'm looking...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Janssen, would you yield, please.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you. As we look at amendment, and for those of you who are following around...following along, it's 1375. The first part that I am concerned about is the phraseology that says that judgments obtained against a government unit, which...they're basically required to pay, a judgment, to the extent such judgment is not paid by liability insurance of a governmental unit. You're intending that to be tort claims or like items and not, for example, if they go to the CIR and have a judgment obtained upon them at the CIR, because that judgment wouldn't be covered by liability insurance, and so it would technically probably fit that. Your intent is basically those are tort claims, or those things for negligence, in that area. Is that correct?

SENATOR JANSSEN: That's correct, Senator Kristensen. But something comes from the CIR is, I believe, is an order not a judgment.