

it either, at this point, but that's what their intent is. I don't know, they're worried about the...what the situation is, is they're worried about the fact that evidently some people object to the 25 mile radius provision of the amendment. I don't have any objection to that. I think it's fine. I voted for the bill, but if others have a concern about it, I suppose tightening it up is in order. But certainly I don't want to open up the six facilities to be anywhere in the state, that is not something I would support. So there seems to be some confusion about what Senator Schmit wants and what this does. But I wish we could clarify, exactly, its impact. But it seems to me that, if they want to tighten the bill up, I'd be...I'd be willing to do that. And I think that's what they're trying to do. So I don't know how to quite resolve it, other than to understand that the intent isn't to open it up, it is to tighten it up. And, with that understanding, I would support the amendment, if that, in fact, what is accomplished by it.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Our next speaker is Senator Schmit. Senator Schmit, you're the last speaker, would you care to close on your amendment.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, I would like to amend my amendment. Can I do that, Mr. President? Okay. Then I would like to withdraw that amendment and ask to offer a new amendment, which would, after striking the new matter on page 2, lines 3 through 6, reinstate the stricken matter on lines 6 through 11, or through 12.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: You're asking unanimous consent?

SENATOR SCHMIT: I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment, and I will offer a new amendment.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Any objection? So ordered. Senator Schmit, to open on the substitute amendment.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, the amendment has been discussed briefly, and I apologize that the language reinstating the stricken matter was not included on the amendment, in my error. And I would ask that at this time that we adopt this amendment, which would do that which I said I wanted to do earlier in the debate upon the original amendment. In other words, it would allow for six branch banks in the corporate limits, as identified by a statute today, and would