

up to the amount that that person owns the joint property, not beyond to the other person's half, but to the half that I own by joint property, I am subject to making sure that that property is available to the satisfaction of my debts. There seems to be no reason to go at the time of probate and reverse that principle and then somehow deny joint property and the attachment of it to the satisfaction of a person's debts. I oppose the Fowler amendment.

PRESIDENT: The Chair would like to take this opportunity to introduce from Senator Cope's District some twenty-five Juniors from Platte Valley Academy at Shelton, Nebraska with Jim Murphy, the teacher, here in the north balcony. Will they stand and be recognized by the Legislature, and welcome to the Legislature. The Chair recognizes Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I am going to keep this very short because Senator Landis, I think, said better what I would like to say than I could say myself. But make no mistake about the amendment to the amendment. It is the equivalent to a kill motion. It addresses the central issue all over again, and I guess it is a little bit discouraging to me that Senator Fowler can stand up and call this a mechanism for fine tuning when this is a mechanism for killing. You know, I always listen pretty closely to Senator Fowler when he talks about things. With regard to Senator Schmit's remarks I might just point out that in the situation where a creditor would conceivably go after joint tenancy property, the burden of proof is on the creditor...the burden of proof in the court of law is going to be on the bank. They have the burden of proof, so I just wanted to make clear what that situation was. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Burrows.

SENATOR BURROWS: Mr. Chairman and members of the body, I support the Fowler amendment and it certainly does just what was said. It would gut the bill. I think one of the things that is highly misleading about the general arguments presented on the bill, the reference has been to banks, and I don't think that is the threat of the problem. If it were restricted to banks, I might vote for the bill, but in most of the circumstances where the abuses will come up it will be from consumer credit, small loan companies and we are not dealing with banks alone on this bill. The real problems of this bill will be where people have gone to joint property for estate purposes, either individual can