

tempted to withdraw it. If it makes Murphy nervous, it makes me nervous. Basically it is an attempt to declare legislative intent and direction to the Banking Department about this bill. There are pending applications for new bank charters, and it is my understanding that the Department of Banking is holding those, waiting for some sort of, I guess, direction with regards to this bill, some sort of sentiment of this Legislature, and with adopting this amendment, I believe that we will have given the direction to the Department of Banking that they can proceed with those new charter applications and review them without worrying about whether or not this legislation will pass and that these new auxiliary facilities will be used as a reason against having a new charter. Essentially the intent is to make sure that this bill does not freeze people out from getting new bank charters. That is the intent of the amendment. I would move its adoption.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is the adoption of the Fowler amendment to LB 491. All those in favor of adoption of that amendment vote aye, opposed no. This is the Fowler amendment to LB 491. Have you all voted? Record.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays on the adoption of Senator Fowler's amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion carried and the Fowler amendment is adopted. What is the next?

CLERK: Mr. President, the next amendment is by Senator Wesely and it is found on page 439 of the Journal.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair recognizes Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, after Senator Fowler's amendment's noncontroversial passage, I can hope only for a similar type of response from the members of the Legislature on this amendment. I believe it is absolutely necessary to the bill to really deal with the situation that we have in Lincoln in particular but also Omaha and throughout the state. Essentially the amendment would do the following: Presently the bill changes the branching option so that one facility would have to be within three...well, presently, it is within three miles of the premises of the original bank. This bill as presently reads would change that from three miles down to 5,000 feet so that that is a much more strict situation that I think was not probably the intention of the bill in the first place. It is overly strict and