

SENATOR GOODRICH: Mr. President, members of the body, Senator Johnson covered the bill so well that it doesn't really leave much to say that hasn't been said already. But what it boils down to is the bill would let federally insured savings and loan accept deposits of real estate trust accounts from real estate brokers. Since the savings and loan industry is the industry that concentrates on meeting the mortgage loan needs of the state it is rather fitting and very convenient for not only the broker but the citizens themselves to have the account...the brokers account right at the savings and loan where they will be closing most of their loans anyhow. I would suggest that since savings and loans now have the authority to have checking accounts, and the fact that the institutions are treated the same as Senator Johnson indicated in the tax bill and in fact at the insistence of the banking industry the banks and savings and loans should be treated the same in the bank...in the taxing of financial institutions, then I would suggest we do let both...either one have the authority to have these deposits. What, for example, if the local community doesn't have a bank, at least have the convenience of having a local savings and loan handy for that purpose, to meet the local people's needs? I just strongly urge you to go ahead and adopt the bill and advance it. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Labeledz, please.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in support of LB 645 as I did last year. It is a good bill. It is a bill which allows the real estate brokers to use savings and loans for the deposit of their trustee accounts. They should be allowed to do this as well as banks for their trust accounts, particularly in light of the fact that most real estate loans are made by savings and loan associations. I wholeheartedly support LB 645.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Thank you, Senator Labeledz. Senator Barrett, please.

SENATOR BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I've had some problems with this bill in the past. I believe this is a...I think this is a reflection of a bill we had about two years ago, as I recall it was 543, had some problems, did not vote at that time on the bill. Since then I've had time to think about it and reflect a bit not only