

isn't it, Chris?

SENATOR ABOUD: Thank you.

SENATOR LANDIS: That's serving up a home run for you.

SENATOR ABOUD: Well, I guess...I guess that makes...that's good for me then. I'm willing to support Senator Will's amendment. We have a Governor here that's going to be serving at least for another two years. He's going to serve after this bill is passed and he's going to be making these initial appointments and I'm assuming, I didn't get to ask Senator Landis the question, but I'm assuming that he assumes that Governor Nelson will probably be serving for an additional four years more. So we have a possibility here of a Governor, a fair, impartial Governor, that should be able to make these impartial decisions serving for another six years. And, for that reason, I think that this particular proposal is a good proposal. Now, Senator Beutler has an interesting approach as well and I'm not to say that that may not be something that we should look at, but at the current time that is not before us and I would prefer to adopt Senator Will's amendment at this time and then take a look at Senator Beutler's amendment and see if that would be something, if Senator Beutler makes a compelling argument that these four judges of the Workers' Comp Court can, in fact, be impartial in making an informed decision. But, at this time, I'm willing to support the Will amendment providing that we're going to be having a Governor there that apparently can mend the fences between business and labor, which he has done with LB 757, and provide that type of reasoned approach to the appointments of the independent medical examiner. I will also add one final point, on the independent medical examiners, that needs to be really addressed here. This particular proposal, the independent medical examiner, a big, big issue in the entire scope of workers' comp reform, was not something that was brought in as a part of the original bill. It was something that was brought in from later on after the bill had been introduced, and we probably could have had a more fair and impartial hearing and heard from the public more directly if it had been a part of the original bill, but that was not the case. The amendment was dropped in so we didn't really get a full hearing on this particular issue. Maybe this is an issue that should be addressed next year. After a time, a bill should be introduced so that we have a public hearing on the issue, and after the public hearing advance the bill out as