

May 4, 1973

PRESIDENT: We'll try.

CLERK: The Carpenter amendment, the last Carpenter amendment, amended the Goodrich amendment (read), the Goodrich basic amendment (read), so if you strike that Goodrich amendment, all amendments thereto would fall.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Yes, that's what we want.

PRESIDENT: Senator Murphy, does that explain it for you.

SENATOR MURPHY: That explains it. I have another suggestion but there aren't enough people here to make it so I'll pass.

PRESIDENT: Well, alright, Senator Dickinson, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DICKINSON: Mr. Speaker and Members of the body. I just walked in but I, if these amendments once get clarified, I hope Senator Schmit will explain exactly or the introducer of the amendment, explain exactly what they do because there was some confusion after we got through the other day.

PRESIDENT: Alright, stand by. Senator Goodrich, back to you.

SENATOR GOODRICH: Mr. President and Members of the body. For a point of clarification, what the bill called for was that we change from having, from letting the banks have one drive up facility located within 2600 feet, that's what the statutes are right now. The bill would have amended that to say that they could have two drive up facilities within 600 feet. Now, the amendment as it was placed on the bill, my amendment, was an effort to come half way between the position of what we call the big banks and the small independent banks. The small independent banks do not want this bill. They want to kill it. I may very well offer a motion to accomplish that end very shortly. However, I am not doing that right now. The big banks, naturally, want this bill because it would give them a second facility. Now, what we did is we tried to arrive at a halfway position so that the big banks would have their second facility and they could have it anywhere within the corporate limits of the city that they were located in, where their charter was located as long as they stayed within the three mile radius or three miles as the crow flies from where their present charter is. That was giving them half of a pie but it wasn't giving them the whole pie. Now the question then remains, the small banks still don't like it but it's more palatable to them than it was at the beginning so they're willing to give a little bit if the big banks would give a little bit. We frankly are in a position where we probably should back off from both groups of banks. We should probably kill this bill and start a study committee and let the study--interim study committee, through the summer, work with both sets of banks, the big ones and the little ones and this month, for example, one group of banks is going to have their convention, starts Monday, in fact. Next month the independent banks will have their convention. Maybe between the two of them after they have had a chance to have their annual conventions and after they in turn have steered a course of action so that they, in turn, if they knew that we were going to have an interim study, they could delegate members of their groups to work with the interim study committee and see if we can't figure out some middle road course of action for them to take, and come back next year with a bill that would be agreeable but it's very true right now this bill as we said when we