

Thank you. Senator Nelson.

SENATOR NELSON: Mr. President, members of the body, Senator Nelson, I am a layman and I'm just trying to understand this in my terms. First of all, I want to say I sincerely support every word that Senator Vickers said. I had had attorneys visit with me about this before I ever came down here. I do not call this an attorneys bill. I call it for just the plain average person. My amendment that I would like to offer, and this was pointed out to me, that cases that involve very large amounts of money, any cases, until this bill becomes effective should not become under this bill. One attorney at home pointed out to me that he has a case in terms of \$6 and \$7 million that's been in court for five years. The interest on this would probably be close to a million dollars and he pointed out that he thought it was a very good bill excepting that it should have this clause. And this is what I am proposing to amend. "On Section 2, this act shall become operative on January 1, 1986, and shall not apply to cases filed before such date." And I'm not sure in my own terms if that's the right thing to put in and I'll let Senator DeCamp speak to that if I'm not correct.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Thank you. Senator Vard Johnson, then Senator Haberman and Senator Beutler.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I would like to make a couple of remarks to support LB 157 and to oppose the kill motion thereon. I guess the first thing I have to talk about is my being a lawyer, my rising to speak on this bill. Obviously there will be those who will suggest there is a conflict of interest so I think it is important that I disclose to this body that I am a lawyer. I do make my living in representing individuals, both as plaintiffs and as defendants. If this bill was to pass and if plaintiffs were entitled to prejudgment interest and if I was allowed a contingency fee on that prejudgment interest, then I would probably benefit therefrom. If this bill was not to pass and I represented a defendant and the defendant could successfully forestall a judgment against him for two or three years, then that defendant would pay me more money. So I guess that whatever conflict of interest I have lies, it depends on whose bread is being buttered, whether it be a plaintiff's bread or a defendant's bread. And because the bill is of great public importance I naturally want to speak