

SENATOR DECAMP: But I'm talking about the personal...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Exactly, and I want...

SENATOR DECAMP: ...and that is why I'm changing the "negligence" to "gross negligence".

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And we are dealing just with the personal liability for the employees.

SENATOR DECAMP: We are dealing just with that liability. Let me explain that further. There was even some thought to deal with other portions, but there...it's pretty well been concluded outside the call, or so it's been argued.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, you've answered my question, so that part I won't push you into.

SENATOR DECAMP: This amendment deals specifically with the personal, and it deals specifically with that aspect of the standard.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay.

SENATOR DECAMP: Your specific example, which is really crystal clear use of the whole situation, demonstrates that in the one situation ordinary negligence would make them personally liable...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Um huh.

SENATOR DECAMP: As I say, that \$12,000 clerk for a \$100,000 bank loss, and I say that probably is unreasonable.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you.

SENATOR DECAMP: ...so, we are changing it to gross.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: The main reason I wanted to propose the question and the example is to show that the lender is not the only one who would be in a position to lose or suffer a loss as a result of negligence, whether it be ordinary or gross.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Haberman, did you wish to speak?

SENATOR HABERMAN: Do you have any other lights on?