

George, you're entitled to think that it's a stalling tactic, or whatever else you want to think that it is, but labels have never deterred me from doing that which I think is proper, and if this motion fails I want you to know, Senator George, and everybody else, that I have another motion that I'm going to put on this bill, and you may become antsy, irritated or whatever, but I have a responsibility as a legislator to do those things that I think are proper. I feel that the action being taken thus far on LB 117 is ill-advised, unjustified and improper, so I must oppose it. I must fight. Those of us who are outnumbered must learn to live by our wits. There are provisions in the rules of this Legislature to delay the legislative process to the extent necessary to allow mature, thoughtful deliberation. We do not have a situation, as was mentioned by one of the founding fathers of the country, maybe an Alexander Hamilton, who stated that the House and the Senate at the national level, are to be complimentary bodies, that the hasty legislation in the House is like hot coffee, and the hot coffee of House legislation must be poured into the Senatorial saucer to be given an opportunity to cool. What he is saying is that there must be a second check given of legislation which may be drafted or acted on in haste by the other body. Since there are not two bodies to this Legislature, there must be individuals in it who will serve the function of allowing the Legislature time to reconsider. I know there are people who are not familiar with the actions of the Small Claims Court, or not familiar in some respects perhaps with practices that occur that are not proper. Now I have the names of three insurance companies, Senator Johnson, and I'm going to take you up on what you have suggested that we do...but State Farm, Farmers Mutual and Blackhawk do this practice. They refuse routinely to pay claims, and apparently State Farm will select various periods when they will refuse to pay all claims. Now these are issues which should be looked into. But since they are problems, I do not think that the Small Claims Court should be corrupted to accommodate these types of activities. If you want to view what we're looking at here today, according to the principle of double effect, you still have a moral obligation to consider that second side effect. The principle of double effect anyway is based on an action which is aimed at producing one result, but a second one can occur. The second one is unintended and perhaps may be neutral...neither good nor bad in and of itself. So, because the first result which is desired is meritorious and justified, the second one is allowable, but in...

SPEAKER MARVEL: Thirty seconds.