will find them on page 1508-1509 of your Journal. I will tell you what they do. They have got two things going for them. First, they narrow the range on which prejudgment interest shall apply and it is a significant limitation. It seriously cuts back the scope of the bill. It says that you are going to get your prejudgment interest on lost wages and special damages. That is lost wages, medical expenses, personal property loss, that is what we are talking about here on special damages, which have not been previously compensated for from whatever source. The second thing the bill does is to create a mechanism that permits a plaintiff or a defendant, once the case is over, to make an allegation that there was strategic delay on the other party's part, and if the judge agrees, if the plaintiff has been the delaying party, then they can bear some costs with respect to the defendant's preparation for the case for that amount of time which the plaintiff was responsible for the delay. In the event it is the defendant that delays, the plaintiff is entitled to receive prejudgment interest on the entire amount of the judgment for whatever period of time the defendant delayed. I also want to point out that there is a presumption that in the event the case is brought to fruition by the time the Supreme Court guidelines allow for such cases, then there can be no finding that there has been unreasonable delay. In other words, only when a case has run over the standard run for such kind of case is a judge empowered to hold such a hearing and make such a finding. Why introduce the amendment? Well, it is my perception, and it is just a political guess, that without some kind of ameliorating language like this, the bill isn't going to pass this year. I think the case is fairly made for some form of prejudgment interest. However, I am not sure the bill as it currently is constituted will be able to pass by the shoals of General File, Select File and on up through Final Reading. There was some discussion in the hearing before the Banking Committee and on General File about the effect of delay, knowing delay, for the purposes of economic benefit, that is why the two-edged sword mechanism that I propose with respect to strategic delays by either party. Why narrow prejudgment interest to special damages and to lost wages? Well, I have some sympathy to the theory which gradually now has finally come to the floor as to why this is a good bill and that is that you need to make a plaintiff whole for an injury that the plaintiff suffers but I guess I don't have the same sense of feeling as to what kind of a loss we are talking about. I know there is an attempt to