

April 24, 1979

LB 87

is facing, and I think that state government, local government, state employees, all can say that inflation has cut their earnings and their ability to survive as much as it's cut the small loan industry. So I think that Senator Chambers' motion is certainly in order, and I think that despite whatever trimmings we've put on the cake here in terms of "consumer protections", which are valuable, that in the end in looking at this bill we are allowing increases to a special industry far beyond what we should allow. So I would support Senator Chambers' amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Wesely, then Senator Schmit, then Senator Newell.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I too rise in support of the Chambers' motion to return LB 87 to strike the enacting clause. I think that in reviewing that bill and in looking at what we did through the different stages of debate basically we gave away the store, that's what I believe. I think that the compromises that we made were compromises on our part but not on their part. What we got basically here in the form of the Final Reading bill on LB 87 is a bill that is all for the small loan companies and very little for the public. From talking to different people about it, basically we gave up a couple...we gave up a great deal in terms of amount of dollars that could be loaned out and the rates that they could be loaned at. In return we got some consumer amendments. Well, from what I have found out in talking to some people is that those consumer amendments gave away nothing, that the federal government in rules and regulations and other restrictions on small loan companies basically required those sort of consumer restraints already. I don't see where we gained anything other than putting into the statutes what they're already doing to an extent anyway. I think also that just from the profits that have come out of the small loan companies over the past year that have been recently announced, it seems to me that they aren't hurting, that they're not in the dire straits they claim to be in, that they don't need this bill to survive, and I really think that looking at all the different facts and information that I have received in the recent past, I just believe that we don't need LB 87. Maybe a bill that doesn't do as much or go as far would be in order. But this gives away too much, and I oppose it and I support the Chambers' motion.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Schmit, do you wish to speak on the