

little too cautious here, and I am going to suggest that we reject this amendment. Thank you.

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

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Mr. President, and members, I have been looking through some materials that were prepared for the Banking Committee as we looked at this issue in hearing, and if you haven't already, let me run through these figures quite quickly. Currently, at the end of 1988, there were \$22 billion, \$22.7 billion in banks deposits, thus the 1 percent figure we are talking about would be \$227 million. So what we are talking about here for each percent is about \$227 million more dollars. That is...we are not talking about a minor issue at this point. Every percent is \$227 million. In addition, FirstTier is currently at about \$2.3 billion, or about \$400 million short of their 12 percent cap. So \$400 million plus \$227 million, those are rough estimates, so there you are talking \$500 million, so that seems like quite a bit. And so the first reaction would be is that all we need? And I think Senator Landis is legitimately raising that issue. Then you look at, though, the institutions that are to be put on the block here shortly by the RTC, and you find that some of those institutions, just one, has over \$500 million in deposits. And so, for instance, if FirstTier did decide that that institution is what they would like to acquire, their flexibility would be gone with just one action. At the same time, you are talking about a significant increase in deposit holdings and influence in the market. So this is a very difficult issue, how to balance out the needs of the institutions with the needs of the state, the consumers, and the public. I tend to agree with Senator Schmit at this point that the phased-in one, two, three offered by Senator Schmit and Senator Lynch make some sense, but I do believe that Senator Landis's point is well taken and perhaps we can look again at that issue at a later point on Select File, where I also plan to raise the issue of community reinvestment. If we are so concerned about out-of-state institutions coming into the state, we ought to have some protections that once here they serve the community, and we have not yet done that. We do have in place in our interstate banking legislation some entry restrictions but we do not, once an out-of-state holding company comes into the state, have community reinvestment standards to hold them to so that we know they will, in fact, serve the State of Nebraska. And I will plan to raise that issue on Select File, as we move