

have to pay claims. But just as important is the lobby on the other side, NATA, as pointed out by Senator Korshoj. Who gains and who wins with passage of this bill? It's perceivable that the business interests would lose if there are more lawsuits filed, and I think there will be either more lawsuits filed, or at least more lawsuits contested, more settlements, and that could probably hurt the business interests. And it's also just as true that the people who make the money when we're in litigation, when you've got a plaintiff versus a defendant, are the NATA association people. They're going to make money on this, if they have more lawsuits filed, and they win, if they're going to have more settlements settled, they won't have to go to court, and believe me there will be a business cost associated with it, whether you go to court or not, if your chances are there, it's a business decision. There will be more settlements outside. And I think if we're going to talk about it, let's at least understand that both sides out there have financial interests in that, both of them do. Senator Landis has pointed out some fairly, fairly explicit stories, and I cannot argue with those stories, I don't know all the cases to them. But I'd also point out to you, especially those of you who have been here for a number of years and have served on committees that deal with fairly sensitive issues, that we do get confronted a lot of times with stories we have callously come to call horror stories. And horror stories exist in every area of our endeavors, whether you want to talk about the optometrist/ophthalmologist issue or any health care issues, mental retardation, mental health, who gets injustice by our system, there is no question that there is injustices in our system. And it's great to point out those kinds of injustices, and if we can correct them, let's do it, that's what we're about. But the question is, are you correcting all the injustices and causing no more? The answer is, I don't know. I think there are tremendous merits to this bill on both sides. My only purpose in standing up here is saying, if we're going to paint a picture, let's paint the real picture. Senator Schimek and I were talking what we're really about is trying to make a decision on what is best for the people of the state. And, as a matter of fact, I agree with her on that, and I agree with her on the other thing that she said is very few of us really know what the ramifications of this bill are all about, and that's unfortunate, because we're being called upon to make that decision. I honestly don't know which is right for the State of Nebraska. I am skeptical, and yet it sounds eminently thin.