

and they are happy. They can live with this language in the original Schmit amendment and that is what we have got here on the floor. On the other hand, I want to go through this argument step by step, briefly, in my closing and then, frankly, we will see where things lie, and my guess is I know where things lie. We will find out, but I am just doing my duty here, okay. This is the way I see it. We have in this state a policy of cautious growth, and if that got amended or changed, I want to know about it because that has been our historical pattern. This amendment in its original form is \$600 million of deposits on top of the existing \$400 million that FirstTier, our largest institution, has. In other words, a hundred million, no, no, I am sorry, a billion dollars worth of growth between what they have now and what they would have with the Schmit amendment on Tuesday morning by ten forty-five. I am not sure we received that kind of an explanation or that much attention to this issue. What they have said is, all right, let's do this on a series of growth. You give us \$200 million in the coming year, \$200 million the year after that, and \$200 million the year after that of growth and we will be satisfied. And my amendment says this, well, now wait a second, time out. You have made an argument. In fact, I don't think you really need it, but, even so, you have made your argument, we will let the first year go by, the \$200 million is there. But the other, the last two years, frankly, we ought to discuss, we ought to know about, and we probably shouldn't wind up coming back from our long weekend to find that this has happened with no explanation, no discussion, no analysis, at least by the Legislature. There is growth for institutions. There is growth to take over S & Ls. Senator Goodrich's characterization of the law is I am sure well-meaning but wrong. If FirstTier buys Occidental under two, three, and four of this act, there is no problem. We have all agreed to it and it won't count against their base, and they will still have \$400 million of growth even after they take over Occidental. The Landis amendment will give them 200 more million dollars of growth. That seems reasonable as well. It is the last \$400 million of growth, which I think this body ought to be apprised of, and if you are well satisfied, if the debate today has been deeply illuminating, if you have had a revelation as to why \$400 million is appropriate in '92 and '93, fair enough. Vote against this amendment and for the Schmit amendment. But if you have doubts, if you would like to have this kind of explanation made to you, if you would like to have the Legislature brought into the loop, if you would like to see the trend lines occur before you commit to this kind of