

centration of economic power that we will all regret. Senator Cullian has said that these amendments provide protection, that the concentration will not be too great. I disagree. We start out authorizing nine banks and where does it go from there, nine banks and nine percent, but this is once the floodgate is open, then there will be no end. There will be a continuing legislation as time passes to relax these restrictions. I have heard a lot today about the problems of bankers but we have heard very little about the situation in regard to the populace. I ask you this, how many people have talked to you lately that said they are having a problem getting the money that they need to operate their farm or their business at a rate that is comparable, is reasonable in this day and age of high interest rates. I will bet that there are very few, almost none. This state is very fortunate in that the banking industry has taken good care of its customers. The farming industry has been well supplied with capital at a reasonable rate. The small businesses have had the same opportunities, have had the same advantages. I submit to you that as we move into multibank holding companies there will be less of the...there will be less consideration to the plight of the businessmen, of the farmer, of the rancher, and I submit that those people are now being well served, better served than most other states in this Union. We have noticed that some of the large banks have changed their position. I submit that most of the smaller banks, most of the customers of banks in this state have not changed their position. I ask that this amendment be defeated, that the bill not be passed.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Hoagland.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I would like to speak just briefly in favor of the DeCamp amendment and in favor of the bill then as amended by Senator DeCamp's amendment. Now I previously opposed this legislation. The last vote that we took on this concept was two years ago and I voted against the bill at that time for two reasons. First of all it seemed to me that the proponents of this legislation had a heavy burden to justify the change in the banking structure that this bill would bring about and, secondly, I felt that if I didn't know enough about an issue, which I didn't feel I did at that time, it really was better not to take a position in favor of significant change. Now over the last two years I have studied this issue carefully, more carefully than most, and I have worried about it a lot and I have thought about it a lot, as we are inclined to do so in this body when the really tough issues come along, and I have attempted to sort out all the pros and cons and