

forward with this legislation. At this point, though, I do plan to support the Schmit amendment and not support the Landis amendment, but I think much more information is needed. I tried to provide a little bit more to you at this point, but still many questions go unanswered, and I think Senator Landis is absolutely right to raise them.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. May I introduce some guests, please, in the south balcony of Senator Scott Moore. We have 21 seventh and eighth graders from Emmanuel Lutheran School in York, Nebraska, with their sponsors. Would you folks all stand and be recognized by the Legislature. Thank you for visiting us today. Senator Landis, please, followed by Senator Lynch, and Senator Labedz.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, I will just use about a minute of my time because the last two speakers, Senator Goodrich and Senator Wesely, interjected a point into the discussion that I need to respond to right away, Occidental's 500 million bucks. The argument goes both from Senator Goodrich and Senator Wesely that in the event FirstTier takes it over, it will dry up any flexibility FirstTier has. That was the argument, but notice what sections two, three, and four, which you have already adopted, which I suggested and agreed to was a good idea, did. It said that that \$500 million of Occidental deposits doesn't count against the cap, doesn't count against the cap. In other words, it does not knock out FirstTier from buying Occidental. They certainly can, and it doesn't knock out flexibility that FirstTier now has to the extent of \$400 million of growth, and if you were to adopt my amendment, that number is up to \$600 million of growth. I don't know how much flexibility you want in two years time. An institution is not going to grow \$600 million in two years time, particularly if what you are saying is, gosh, we've taken over a \$500 million institution that isn't getting any new deposits because that is the story with Occidental. They are just not going to grow that fast. I will be happy to respond later to other things, but it seems to me critical that we distinguish what is going on here. FirstTier is not endangered with either their flexibility or their growth if you adopt two, three, and four, and, in fact, if you adopt the first part of section one. It is exactly what they are asking for for the year 1991. What you just are not allowing them is '92 and '93's growth until they make the explanation and we see what the patterns are and we see what happens in the marketplace. That is reasonable, and it is reasonable to bring