

March 21, 1973

with 153. I'll vote to put it on the floor but the amendments that were made on that bill are Committee amendments. They are recommendations to this Legislature, either to accept or reject. There is nothing in this that would not allow Senator Warner or Senator Carstens on either 161 or 153 on the floor of this Legislature to ask for a rejection of the amendment. The thing of it is what happens on the floor, your Committee does not act on the floor. It only acts during its Executive session. So, consequently, in response of that, the Committee could not act on Committee amendments on the floor were they not there previously. It would have to be an individual amendment, and I think both of these bills have amendments which are Committee amendments and I would like to see both of them advance to the floor in the shape that they are right now, and then let the interested party in taking these particular amendments off of the bill, take them off of the bill.

SENATOR PROUD: Well, then, I will just make a short statement. I don't deal in the automobile insurance field. Senator Syas does and I have a great deal of respect for his opinion in this field. I might or anybody else might differ with him on any particular aspect but, nevertheless, he is an expert in the automobile insurance field. Perhaps, the time has come now where we should dispose of this issue on the floor. I was on the Banking Committee last year and we heard, I think...I think we had five so called "no-fault" bills. We killed them all. The Committee has now killed a couple of them again. It does seem to me that we should, probably, now face the issue. If that involves bringing them both to the floor, that is what it involves. I know the men who have worked long and hard on this...one of these bills, Mr. Jack Pace and Mr. Dwight Perkins who I have the highest respect for. They feel very strongly about this. They have spent untold amount of time on it. They are very worried about the Federal government taking this over. Now, I don't know whether this is going to happen or whether it isn't going to happen, but I know they are worried about it. So, I, myself, I'm in favor of putting this 161 up here. If it is necessary to put the other one along with it, that's OK with me, too.

SENATOR DUIS: Thank you very much. In response to your question, I think I can go ahead and I know the gentlemen involved, too, and they, I presume, were involved in the undue criticism of my amendments, I do believe, and I'm very sorry for it. I regard both of these gentlemen with high regard even though they do not me. I'm terribly sorry that this has happened, but there was no intent on my part to injure either one of these two fine gentlemen who are in the insurance industry. My principal concern here was at the public hearings, Senator Proud, not a soul appeared of the general public. We only had people from the industry and from the law profession which, I guess, is the way it should be, but I did feel as though as a representative of thirty some thousand people of a district and a million and a half of the state of Nebraska that I did owe something to those other people who did not have the privilege or did not take the time or whatever you might call it of being here on the so called "no-fault" bills, and I will reiterate my position. If they will just rename this differently when they are establishing fault. If they wish to collect from the other person, they do not have "no-fault". Now, Senator Waldron, for you and for Mr. Pace and the other gentlemen, I can't call his name right now, I suppose again which I did a year ago when they kept after something and kept after something that I probably will be the one that will have to give in to the industry. I am in the business. It does bother me a little bit when the industry does take positive positions like this because most of these gentlemen never deal with the general public, but this is fine with me.