

They call, they recall their products, they issue warnings, they do public relations, they give rebates, they give refunds, they do everything in their power to try to correct the situation. But the ones who intentionally misrepresent or conceal are the bad actors. Now, by taking out the useful life, Senator Crosby and others had the products liability cases in the area of the medical implants, the prosthetics, appliances and those other devices surgically placed within the human body. I put that into this amendment. I really do believe that those are things that you've got to address. That is another exception. Asbestos is an exception that this body had chose to do. They didn't get rid of the Statute of Repose when there was a problem. Before, what they did was they put an exception. I do the same exception so this exception would be those that intentionally misrepresent or conceal and those who manufacture the construction of the medical implants. We've had an extensive debate on the medical implants. I think that's a given. If somebody wants to redebate that, that's fine. I'm sure Senator Crosby will leap to her feet and give you a great summary of what has been done in the past. I don't think that that's the issue. The issue is going back to useful life. Now why don't we like the useful life? Here's the problem. When you go to a useful life system, you have another element and you add more to that case because you're going to have to prove and establish what useful life is. Who knows what useful life is? You certainly don't want the manufacturer to determine because they're all going to put a sticker on that says, the useful life of this product is one year. That's not fair either. But at the same time there is certainly an ending point to every product, even the simplest product. But what happens is that that adds more to the litigation and it's a roll of the dice. The favorite thing that you'd want to do, you'd always want to get to the jury. You know if you can get to the jury, you've got a chance. You've always got a chance, a motion. The worst the damages, the worst the situation, the better chance you have because people will look past what the law is and do what their heart tells them to do. And as much as you'll get a jury instruction that says, take sympathy out of this, it doesn't happen. So sometimes what happens, the worst case produces some of the worst legal results and this useful life will add more to that and it's a risk. It's a risk and a gamble that if you're going to go in, you're not going to do it. If you've got a real bad fact situation, you're going to try, you're going to say, look, I know we're right, we don't have defective but I can't afford the risk and so what do they do? They settle. The