

May 13, 1981

LB 376

simply reinstates the stricken language which we have on lines 22 and 23, and reinstates the stricken matter on 24 through a big part of 27, which reinstates the three mile section that says that one of the three auxiliary teller offices shall be located within three miles of the parent bank. I think this needs to be reinstated, what the committee deleted, because I think it's essential. I think it is a sound provision and it should be continued. The rationale is simply that most banks who have complied with this particular provision of the law have invested considerable amount of money, bricks and mortar. The two comply with the law. They have located their auxiliary teller offices and reliance on the present statute. If we strike these two lines to eliminate the three miles, I think it would be an unfair advantage for new banks who are attempting to branch or for banks...existing banks that are trying to branch that do not now have auxiliary teller offices. Such banks wouldn't have to build a facility within the three mile limitation making a competitive edge over the banks that have complied already with the existing statute. They have complied with the law. The remainder of my amendment simply attempts to strike sections 2 and 3 of the bill and also makes some technical changes on lines 4 and 5 on page 10. In my opinion, it is most definitely germane, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: All right, I have....does that constitute your statement?

SENATOR BARRETT: Yes, thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Barrett. I have before me both the standing committee amendment and your amendment to the amendment. There is no doubt about the fact in the opinion of the Chair that it is germane to the issue before us, but I am going to rule that it is not germane to the very narrow committee amendment which only deals with one word and this is a considerable expansion on that concept of germaneness to the bill as a whole. So it is germane to the bill as a whole for which reason, Senator Barrett, you have every perfect right to make this amendment to the bill as a whole, which will follow the adoption of the committee amendments. And then, of course, you have a right to amend anything you want to on the bill as a whole once the committee amendments have either been rejected or adopted. You have a privilege of rejecting the committee amendment which would reject one word change if that is what you want. So I am going to rule that it is not germane as an