

of you have, or maybe the rest of you don't. I am particularly interested because it is tough sledding. It certainly is, but so far on the floor I haven't heard it. Anyway, I am here to be recognized on two, three, and four. I say it is good policy. It ought to pass. We ought to allow these transfers to take place without harming the availability of our existing bank holding companies to grow. Now there is an argument that our old Bank Holding Company Act is out of date and, in fact, the policy ought to be changed. We ought to allow it to expand so that we don't allow our biggest bank holding company to brush up against the deposit cap, limit its growth, and, therefore, make it susceptible to out-of-state takeovers of bigger banks. I can understand that argument but I will tell you this. It runs afoul of our existing policy and I am not so sure that that policy change ought to be made on the floor of the Legislature without greater study and greater awareness of what this body is doing all the way along the line, in other words, to come in and to explain to the body what that is all about. I am going to vote for two, three, and four. I will renew my light and inquire again as to the purpose of section one.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Lynch, please, followed by Senator Wesely.

SENATOR LYNCH: Mr. President, and members, probably now is a good time for me to explain two things. First of all, I will support the division of the question, obviously, and the sections two, three, and four. I took this as a priority bill and that is the reason it is on the floor for discussion now for a couple of reasons. Before I mention anything more though, I would like to also tell you how competent our Chairman of the Banking and Insurance Committee is. Dave probably understands these issues as well as anyone and I can certainly sympathize and appreciate his concern about a change on the floor this morning. David, and anyone else, when I took this as a priority bill, I think I understood the legislation and the intent of the legislation; and as we know at the hearing, there was not that much excitement over it. There was one opponent and two or three for it, but it did have to do with important policy. It came out of committee six to one, if I remember right, and one abstaining. When I took it as a priority, of course, the amendments as we are now discussing, did not exist but now that they exist I have to mention to you that I also, when I took it as a priority, did it for a number of reasons. We have an eminent problem in Nebraska that has to do with failing