

March 21, 1973

damage if we wanted to do it and I would be for it. I'm not opposed to that and I think, and Senator Carstens has known that for a long time because I sponsored a bill last year that would have included property damage. Now Senator Carstens points out that we would include any payments for the first 14 days. That's not true. What it does, it says the policy may be written to exclude the first 14 days but we do this, then if the individual wanted to be covered during the first 14 days, he could ask for this coverage from his insurance company. What we're trying to do is make it for the average person at a lesser cost by saying the insurance industry may write it from 14 days so they can be covered if he wants to and he can choose one way or another. I hope and there was some confusion over x-rays here, but let me tell you: You can include all the x-rays that you want to by amendment in this bill and I will certainly not object; as a matter of fact, I will support them. If Senator Carstens is correct in what he says and he is partially correct in what he said, I told him before that I will take an amendment to this bill to include all x-rays in any case and they will be covered under this bill. I don't believe, in Senator Stull's case, that you could take one case like that and have some attorney research it and decide himself what you would have got under one plan versus another plan because that's almost impossible. We want to cost this plan out versus the other plan that's been offered to this Legislature, we can spend \$6,000 and send it to a group that will actually provide a costing for it and I would like to do that, but let me restate that I'm willing to bring this bill to the floor of the Legislature, bracket it on general file and hold it until such time as we have an idea whether the Federal Government is going to demand that we act this year or next year and then we can take further action on it at that time so I ask for your vote this morning to place it on general file. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Question is, shall L.B. 161 be placed on general file notwithstanding the action of the committee. All those in favor will vote aye. All those opposed will vote no. Question is, shall L.B. 161 be placed on general file notwithstanding the action of the committee. Senator Waldron's indicated that he would bracket the bill on general file immediately, as soon as it's there. Have you all voted? Go ahead, we'll wait for you to vote, Senator Carpenter. Have you all voted? Senator Carpenter, you can vote if you want to, we're still--have you all voted? Clerk will record.

CLERK: 35 ayes, 4 nays, 10 not voting, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: L.B. 161 is placed on general file.

CLERK: Now, Mr. President I have another motion (read).

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator Luedtke.

SENATOR LUEDTKE: Mr. President and Members of the Legislature. I would move that we then follow with as many have spoken before, that we put 153 on general file under the same circumstances. I don't think there is any need for any further debate. This is the other bill dealing with no fault or so-called no fault, whatever you want to call it. We now will have both of them before us. If the committee couldn't take any action on either of them and killed both of them, if one comes out on the floor, we should have both of them on the floor in case the Federal Government wants to force us into some action, we can have a choice between the two so--Mr. President, without any further ado, I think we've long enough discussed this matter and I'd ask that we also put this one on general file under the same