

much, or 1 percent, or there is enough with \$400 million float out there for the biggest institution. But let's not make this any more of a complicated issue than it is. In its present form I think it works pretty well. I thought, when Senator Landis talked about an earlier amendment, when I talked to him, that he was concerned with the amendment we're talking about now as to whether or not he would support or not support the bill. So I was surprised to hear so much emotion and concern about the legislation based on the Wesely amendment not passing. And I have to admit that I share the concerns of Senator Warner.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time. Senator Wesely, further discussion. Thank you. Any further discussion on the adoption of the Landis amendment? Senator Landis, for closing.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a history on this bill, and I hope you'll take a chance to think back to General File and the claims and the arguments that I made then, I hope you would take a look that this is the only amendment with my name put on Select File and it's entirely the same issue. It's what I have always argued, it's what I'm going to argue today. This is the piece of change that I suggest to the body and it's consistent with what I asked on General File. You might remember on General File I said that there was a good part of the amendment that I liked and that was for the largest banks to be free to take over failed S&Ls without respect to any influence on the deposit cap. Separated the question, voted for that amendment; argued in favor of it, gave the justification. I then said, you know, none of our banks are within \$400 million of the existing cap. To raise an existing cap, which is not now a burden to anybody, by \$600 million was biting off a lot, particularly since it's a major change in the public policy of the state. And I counseled that we should cut that down by \$400 million, that we should accept a 1 percent change to acknowledge that, the problems that were there, but by doing so you would allow for \$600 million of growth in our largest bankholding company. I now have moderated that view and rather than asking for \$400 to be cut out of the bill, I am now saying, let's cut \$200 million out of the bill, it will bring the date in which this argument will come back to us for justification, explanation and review a little earlier, that's true, as well we should. At the time my opposition included the very banks who wanted this language, FirstTier, Norwest. Subsequently, they have reflected on it. I have come up \$200 million and they have come down \$200 million. Now if that's a bad idea, if there is