

doing opposing a bank bill? And it is a fair question. I am opposing the largest bank in this state when I really should be seeking their favor, but so long as I stand in this Chamber, I will not respond to that kind of a demand. I am objecting to this particular bill because, one, it abrogates due process of government. There are laws on the statutes or on the books of the state. They are very specific and they have been violated. I do not think that while the court is considering this issue, we have the slightest business nor the slightest right to insert ourselves into this process and say we are going to change it. If we are, then let us also change the law on a case of assault and say it was a technicality. The girl was only 200 feet from her bed. I further object to the very blatant manner in which this particular institution has said, if the court does not give us what we want, we will go to the Legislature and get it. They may do so. I sincerely hope not. Now I am further concerned, and we all should be, in that both the Director of Banking and the court have said, very explicitly, that the condition as it exists destroys the issue of competitive equality and that it is patently obvious on the face of it that it does so and I do not believe that I, as a Senator, from a town that is not directly affected by this particular piece of legislation should lie down and say, well, it is not going to affect me. I could care less about the smaller banks of Omaha. Because if you do that, the next issue may be mine and I would not want those people in Omaha to say I could care less about District 17 and any unfairness that legislation may create in that area. I think probably my strongest objection is the issue of can one of the three hundred largest banks in this nation, and by far the largest bank in this state, ignore the laws as they have done? Can they violate the laws, operate two banks in contravention to the specific dictate of the Director and of the statutes, and I don't mean an extra facility, I mean conduct two banking operations under one charter? Can they subvert the rules of the Legislature? Can they subvert the rules of the Department of Banking by misleading information as is clearly indicated and accomplish their own ends regardless. It will be a terribly dark day when this Legislature becomes party to this kind of action. But the thing that really offended me was that the testimony at the committee was, if we don't get it from the court, we are going to get it from the Legislature. That was testified to in the committee hearing and it was not rebutted and I, for one, am not going to be handled in that manner. I hope they do not make good on their boast. Looking at the literature that I handed out, I would like you to look at the calendar of what has happened and I would like to correct a couple of misstatements that have been made. One, it was said on this floor on General File, when I was not here to fairly debate it, that the Nebraska Bankers Association supported this measure and I say to you that is patently false. It is not an opinion. It is a written statement of the Nebraska Banking Association and they do not support this issue. In fairness, I will say they have very definitely declared they would remain neutral. They have members on both sides of the issue, but to say that they support it is utterly false. Just as it is false that the bill itself said, the purpose of the bill is to define for the first time what an attached facility is. If it is the first time, it seems odd that the thing that we are arguing about is the definition. There has been a