

March 21, 1973

(Start Belt #13)

also and Senator Carstens may correct me if I'm wrong, is my understanding that the people that wanted 153 introduced asked the committee to kill it and they did so, so I don't see why now they have changed their mind now will want to revive 153 after they have asked that it be killed, and, but the main reason is that this is a trial attorney's bill, it means perpetuation of the present system where attorney's end up with a goodly share of the settlement in the big cases -

PRESIDENT: Senator Waldron, the Chair is going to take the prerogative of terminating debate here at this particular time in that we do have a motion to adjourn, we will take up the rest of the debate on this motion and so forth, tomorrow, we have other business on the desk, alright, I'm sorry, wait a minute, alright now the Chair is giving bad information here, Senator Duis, you had asked to speak, there was another light on, I'm sorry, then I cut that off, Senator Duis, Senator Waldron do you want to go ahead and finish your debate, I'm sorry, apparently they want to go ahead and vote on this, so we'll do it. Go ahead Senator Waldron, then Senator Duis.

SENATOR WALDRON: Mr. President, members of the legislature, I'd just as soon we took up the motion to adjourn, myself, I wouldn't, as a matter of fact I appreciate it if someone would push the Chair to do that, I will not do that, because I know Senator Luedtke's position, you know, he wants to get this resolved, as I want to get it resolved before we start. Would encourage you not to adopt this, if on general, if on general file, they think they have the influence to adopt 153 instead of 161, they can amend LB 161 to adopt the features of 153, we only need one bill on general file as a vehicle to enact legislation, there is absolutely no reason to have two bills, then we will be messing around if one passes, or if one gets killed, then we will do the same thing with the next bill, fighting amendments one against the other, so one bill can serve as a vehicle for anything we want to do in the no fault area, and I personally think it should be LB 161. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Duis.

SENATOR DUIS: Very briefly. Senator Waldron would you please above all things stop calling one bill no fault and the other bill fault, because until your bill 161 is amended without subrogation it is not a no fault bill, so let's go into that premises again, because I think the news media is entitled to inform the public that under LB 161, the insurance company that pays the claim has the right to go against the other persons' insurance company to collect it back, so I think it's a good idea that we get the record straight, because 153 should be out here just as well as 161.

PRESIDENT: Now wait a minute, Senator Waldron I'm not going to let you respond for a moment, I'm going to go back to Senator Fred Carstens, has asked to be recognized. You can respond in a minute after that.

SENATOR CARSTENS: Mr. President, members, I'm very sorry to even rise at all, but this whole thing, now Senator Waldron clearly reveals what he was up to when he tried to raise his bill, and he now opposes it, but, by the ascertain that 153 is not a no fault bill, that is not correct, there are probably a hundred, a hundred and fifty different types of no fault bills, and it is misleading to the legislature to say that 153 is not a no fault bill, and the fact that it was sponsored, worked up and written by the bar association, I'm not going to flail the