

Senator Landis, who rarely practices law, says lawyers would simply raise their fee if this amendment were adopted. I offered this amendment for the lawyers to show that they brought this bill in good faith. Now I believe fees are usually agreed upon before you ever go to court. If they want to raise it to 35 percent, as I understand it from the attorneys, you have got the right to shop attorneys in Omaha, Lincoln, Scottsbluff, Grand Island, wherever you go. So if one attorney wants 35 percent, you can go and find one for 30 percent because I am sure attorneys don't have set fees. That would be antitrust. It, believe me, Senator Landis, is not a "don't like lawyers" amendment. It was to show that the lawyers were sincere in trying to really help their plaintiffs. Senator Landis made the statement that the law shouldn't get into collecting fees, that we don't do that in any other instance. Senator Landis, the law set up the State Liquor Commission and I would say that the State Liquor Commission acts as a collection agency, as a collection agency for liquor distributors because they force bar owners to pay cash when they have beer delivered and they have to pay for liquor and other spirits within thirty days or they lose their license or they are called before the Liquor Commission. So, you see, we already have that done through the Liquor Commission acting as really what I consider nothing but a collection agency for liquor wholesalers and distributors. I, personally, don't care whether this amendment passes or fails. Senator Haberman says, watch out, if this amendment passes, it might make it the kind of a bill that you would vote for. You weren't there at the committee hearing or you would have heard me cross-examine the insurance companies and I might say, kind of skin them alive. I worked for insurance companies for twenty years. I know how they delay these things, but I am sure when we finish discussing this amendment there will be discussion on the bill itself so I will approach that when that time comes and prove to Senator Landis that I am not antilawyer, I am not anti-insurance companies. I just want to do what the trial lawyers said they wanted to do, make the person who has been injured whole and complete again. As far as sewing on a little piece of finger that was lost, the doctor could have done nothing and then they would be missing part of the finger. That analogy just doesn't make much sense. He is talking about physical and we are talking about economical wholeness. So, senators, it is entirely up to you. You won't hurt my feelings if you don't vote for the amendment. All you will be doing is saying that the