

enough, but, gosh, should we be doing it on Monday morning at nine fifty-six in three or four lines in number one of an amendment that hasn't been explained to us? It is a reversal of our traditional policy. It may be justified. I am not exactly sure but, gosh, I have got to think with \$400 million to play with and no impending doom, a chance to buy any of these failing institutions so it doesn't apply to the cap, that we really aren't in a rush, and maybe the body is entitled to a little better explanation and study than what has happened this morning. That is my reaction. Now if there is a justification here, all right, but let's hear it. Let's have it before us before we act on this question. I will vote for two, three, and four. I need to hear more on section one.

PRESIDENT: Were you through, Senator Landis? Thank you. Senator Schmit, please.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, and members, I would just like to agree with Senator Landis. I believe that he makes an excellent point when he discusses the various amount of negotiations that go on outside of the framework of the Legislature, itself, and outside of the framework of the committee, and I apologize to you, Senator Landis. I should have insisted that you be brought into the negotiations based upon the fact that you are chairman of the committee and, certainly, you are the individual who has, I think, in almost every instance, exercised strong leadership and strong support for some very good legislation for the past two years. And this is not the first time nor do I suppose it will be the last, if we allow it to continue, that legislators, myself included, will find on the floor of this Legislature that an agreement has been reached. Senator Landis has raised the point on a number of occasions over the last several years, and I concur with him, and I would just have to say that this is not the first time this year that it has happened, and that, from time to time, it has happened to me, also, and I don't appreciate it. I would also say that I did try to contact some individuals. Because of the constraints of time, I was unable to get a hold of everybody, but I would say that I would hope that I can explain to Senator Landis's satisfaction why I believe it is necessary to have part one of the amendment. As I stated earlier, since 1973 when I first spoke in support of multibank holding legislation on this floor, I insisted that we had to have not more institutions but stronger institutions. I insisted that a proliferation of small institutions could, in fact, be