

January 24, 1980

LB 491, 69

SENATOR DWORAK: Okay. I oppose the kill motion. I think there are two bills here that are very closely related, LB 69, the multibank holding company bill and the bill we are debating, 491, and I think if we take action at this time on 491 we put a greater amount of emphasis on LB 69. I think that we see an attempt here by those proponents of LB 69 to have the only game in town and I think it would be ill-advised to kill this argument and this point of view at this time and leave the other one intact. That would be a mistake. Senator DeCamp makes a good point about the authorization across the state not being completely fulfilled and when you look at it on a state level that makes a pretty sound and convincing argument but when you start isolating portions of the state I think we see the fallacy of his argument and I think the community I am from is a good point of reference. We have used our detached facility extension as much as we can and we are desiring to use it more and I think other communities are in that same situation. So what may be so in one area of the state is not so in another area of the state. It seems to me that this authorization should be granted because in those communities where the need exists, where people need access to additional facilities, where the banks can better serve those people, they should be allowed the right to do that. Now this bill has another portion in it in addition to just number of facilities that are very important and that is allowing additional services in these detached facilities and I think this is very important. I again refer to Columbus where we have a detached facility near our industrial site and now we are not allowed or not authorized to offer installment loan services or other services out of this facility. Now it would be very convenient for those customers to be able to use this detached facility for these type of services rather than bringing them down into the heart of the city to do this type of banking transaction. I think it has a lot of energy ramifications. I think it has a lot of convenience ramifications as far as really being able to serve that public. Now I think another point that we have to remember is that savings and loans do not have that kind of restriction and there is a proliferation of these organizations and I am not necessarily opposed to that but I think to be fair and keep the financial institutions on equal footing you are going to have to allow the banks the same kind of opportunity that savings and loans now have. I think the fact that we do have 69, the fact that we do have 491 and there are two concepts it would be ill-advised until we heard the debate on 69 to finally adjudicate 491 and vice versa. So I think that a kill motion at this time would be ill conceived. I think we are only getting half of