

May 4, 1973

PRESIDENT: All right we still have before us, the Schmit amendment which would strike the Goodrich amendment and Senator Fred Carstens is next to speak, then Senator Snyder then Senator Carpenter. Senator Fred Carstens, did you wish to be heard on this issue. We have Senator Schmits motion which would strike the Goodrich amendment to LB 312 on select file. That is the issue still before the body.

SENATOR CARSTENS: Well I understand I believe Senator Carpenter objected to the motion. Is that correct?

PRESIDENT: I'm sorry I didn't hear you.

SENATOR CARSTENS: The point of order, are there objections to this motion?

PRESIDENT: Yes.

SENATOR CARSTENS: Ok, I just want to mention that the matter of study committee, is totally and completely obnoxious to me. I know there's not, that is for this issue, because if anything has ever been studied today, this is, and I don't know what we could do in a study committee too. We'd hear the same thing. We heard all fall. We heard the same thing we heard this spring in the hearing we had here. We'd hear the same thing, the same issues. There's nothing involved in the issues that people involved in the business don't understand and the study committee is just another delaying tactic and I'd like to see and I'd like to see this body dispose of this thing once and for all. So that we can get this thing. It will be the same old hassle next session. Get this thing out of the way and be down with it. Now basically and this constant talk about the big bank. Now I have tried to explain in the previous few days ago when this matter came up. I have no interest, I support neither large banks or small banks. We have no large banks in my district, but this 2,600 foot limitation which has been the law for a number of years. I think 7 or 8 years. Just simply doesn't work in our community. In the cities, live with, with populations of 6, 8, 10, 12,000 population, when you get a 2,600 foot limitation, from the barren bank, you end up in nowhere ville and the only thing that this bill does is to add, allow one more facility within the city limits of a city, one more facility. It retains the 2,600 foot limitation, adds one more facility. That was the original bill. Now Senator Goodrich came in with his 3 mile limit, amendment, I don't know where he picked that up, but he wanted to, I suppose kill the bill. That was the purpose of it. Now the original bill with a city limits limitation for an additional facility makes sense. Now in my own community, we have 2 shopping centers. One on the east edge of town and one on the north edge of the city. These are approximately 2 miles, 1½ to 2 miles from the barren bank, from the banks now located in the city. The 2,600 foot limitation doesn't make any sense at all. It is a joke. It is meaningless, and this is what we're trying to correct and I'm trying to correct, I'm not in support of large banks, not in support of small banks. In spite of what Senator Murphy said the other day, I'm not being lobbied to death. We're trying to correct the situation that has come up and I'm sure it is true in Scottsbluff. I'm sure it is true in Hastings, I'm sure it is true in Grand Island, I'm sure it is true in all cities, there are other cities in this State besides Omaha, and there are other cities in this State that need these conveniences and they need the service besides Omaha and I don't know if the, if the, it is unfortunate that this thing has gone the way it has, but as far as the study committee is concerned. Let's forget it. Because if we have a study committee on this, we'll hear