

all aspects of the bill will explain those matters but the amendments offered by the committee you will find will be for the purpose, first, of clarifying when Workmen's Compensation laws will or will not apply, so if you turn to page 3 of the bill, line 5 or line 6, after the word "arrangement", it gives additional language relating to the Workmen Compensation statutes and you can read what the amendment is. The second amendment would be the insertion of the word "var" on page 4 which was inadvertently left out when the bill was drafted, and because of various provisions in the bill, it was felt wise to add the severability clause. A major amendment will be found on pages 4 and 5 where Sections 9 and 10 of the bill as drafted will be stricken. Since we have a bill before us now dealing with modification of the guest statute, this language even without that bill was considered objectionable, but in view of what we are doing with the guest statute bill, this would be even more objectionable because it attempted in the original draft of this bill to define as a guest "a person who pays for transportation". Even under the guest statute unmodified, if you were paying for your transportation and you were injured, then you would not be covered or prohibited from seeking damages against the driver. This bill as originally drafted would have said that even though you have paid for the transportation, you will nevertheless be considered a guest for purposes of the operation of the guest statute. The committee felt it wise to strike Sections 9 and 10. If you have any questions on the committee amendments, I will answer them, but if you want to hear the whole totality of the bill in context, it might be best to listen to Senator Landis and then address your questions at that time, but however you want to do it, it is up to you. I move the adoption of the committee amendments.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Landis, do you wish to speak to the committee amendments? You want to speak to the bill as a whole.

SENATOR LANDIS: I will speak just tacitly to the committee amendments. At the time I introduced LB 50 I asked the Judiciary Committee to make a policy decision with respect to the guest statute, and then from that decision order their reaction to LB 50. They did so. They chose to report out to the floor of the Legislature the repeal of the guest statute and, therefore, since Sections 9 and 10 retained the guest statute and, in fact, broadened its coverage, that was antithetical to the decision on the guest statute. Since they arrived at that policy decision and the body as a whole has reiterated the fundamental soundness of the repeal of the guest statute, those sections of LB 50 are quite properly