

therefore, urge you to reject the Fowler amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Chambers and then Senator DeCamp, and then Senator Landis.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, and Senator Fowler, I'm very glad you brought forth this amendment, but I think Mr. Ruth and the Bar Association, and maybe some judges have even gotten involved...have probably done their work and the amendment will go down to defeat, but I want to take this opportunity to point out the closed, protected nature of the legal profession. It feels it is accountable to nobody. It feels that it has a certain little bit of protected turf known as the practice of law, and what is this practice of law? The practice of law is whatever the court says it is. And what do courts say that the practice of law is? The practice of law is the doing of those things that only lawyers do, or can do. And what can a lawyer do? What the court says he can do. Well what does the court say he can do? Those things which a lawyer can do, and that is the way the nonreasoning, the unreasoning manner by which courts have set aside certain bits of terrain in various states to make sure that lawyers...highly incompetent lawyers in some instances, may be guaranteed the opportunity to make a living. There are certain forms which anybody who can read English and understand it can fill out, but the lawyers have gotten together and told the judges that we need you to say that real estate dealers cannot fill out these forms...lawyers can. Yet it may be an area where the lawyer has not as much expertise as the individual real estate dealer, or the CPA or accountant, but the lawyers have persuaded the courts to set it aside for them, so the lawyers botch up a person's work. But to avoid that happening, a lawyer can retain an accountant to do the work and pay the accountant and then get money from the individual who needed the work done but couldn't have it done by an accountant because it's like the practice of law. What kind of nonsense is that? Now you have a situation where the Bar Association is contemplating going into business. The Supreme Court can be very arrogant. Judges, even of a lesser level, can be arrogant. Why one in Omaha has the nerve to indicate that I don't have a right to inquire into activities of the public defender's office, and he got to shaking his little robes and flexing his little muscles, and wrinkling his face and almost threatening me because I'm looking into what's happening in the public defender's office. His name is Judge John Grant, and I'm going to write him a letter and distribute