

and favoring of the Beutler amendment that that is the only thing you're willing to consider. And when I say you, I meant the people you are trying to work with.

SENATOR LANDIS: That's right. Look, I will entertain...as a matter of fact, if I had a chance to sit down, there may be some language that I can agree to. I can agree to the Beutler amendment. There are some other things that I might be able to conceptually agree to. I will be happy to endeavor to do that. In the nine and a half hours that we have discussed that, there's been limited opportunity for me to respond to language that I could agree to, but given alternatives which have been worded in a way that I didn't approve of. So, yes, I would entertain an offer.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you.

SENATOR LANDIS: I would entertain an alternative.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I had said how strongly opposed I am to LB 757. That was LB 757 as introduced, LB 757 in its current form. I had said that I would do all I could to defeat this bill and I intend to do that. However, if changes of a substantive nature were made to LB 757 so that it did not, in my opinion, hurt the workers, as 757 in its current form does, my opposition naturally would have to diminish, but it would not be totally removed. Senator Landis is working with others on this bill, in the same way that Senator Lindsay is working with people on LB 110, so we can talk about amendments on this floor, they can seem ever so reasonable and rational but the ones managing the respective bills are not in a position to make an independent decision, therefore, we have to battle on the floor, battle away from the floor and try to create in the record what our opposition is, and that's what I'm trying to do. In the same way though that a person managing a bill in concert with others who are dictating the terms, we would face by analogy the similar situation with these IMEs who are appointed by the court. The court makes out its list. There is no way to challenge that list or get anybody else on it. If nobody on the list is acceptable to the two warring or contending sides, they still are limited to that list when the judge decides that he is going to appoint somebody from that list when everybody on the list has already been rejected. When the insurance people and the employers come here with this bill telling us it is based on compromise, that everybody gave and