

penalty for either side that uses a delay in a trial for strategic purposes. If that is the case let me suggest to you that if you will endorse that as your object, that that is a goal you want the law to achieve, that you do two things. That you turn back the Beyer amendment, that you keep 157 alive and that you send that message to the lobby. We endorse the principle that says, if you're tying up a lawsuit because you think it is going to pay off in the end and you want either interest to run or because you're trying to squeeze somebody on the other side, we want to have that come to an end. We want to have a system of some sort of penalty for either side and let it fall on both of them when they make a delay, it's for a strategic purpose, then take the time to allow this group and the lobby to work on that principle. If you vote for the Beyer amendment right now you're saying, huh uh, we don't endorse that theory. We endorse the current theory and that is there is no interest, there is no penalty, there is no punitive action for the delay of trials and lawsuits ad infinitum in the law. And if you want to hold things up, if you want to drag your heels, if you want to run to three and four and five years, you can and there is no problem. I will be happy to take that message and sit down with a group and try to achieve that principle if you will endorse that principle today. I think 157 can be the vehicle to do that. If you're not satisfied with it in its current form, keep it alive and simply say we want a mechanism that penalizes strategic delay. I don't care if it's plaintiffs, I don't care if it's defendants. You don't have it in the law today. You will be endorsing the continuation of having nothing like that in the law today if you vote for the Beyer amendments. I would ask that you not do that. I would ask that if you concur with me that that's the goal you want that you have to leave this bill alive and you have to tell the lobby to get to work and compromise this bill to a manageable form that embodies that principle.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Vickers, then Senator Labedz.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President, members, first of all I want all the members of this body to listen up and the people in the rotunda because now you have somebody that is not an attorney standing up and saying that this bill is a good bill. Now I want you to all look at your bill books. I want you to look at those people that opposed the bill. I want you to ask yourself if you as an individual would be