

creditors after the death of the decedent for the allowance of claims for debts contracted for in writing. It is the opinion of this office that LB 306 as amended does grant a different right to creditors or claimants after the death of the decedent than such creditors or claimants would have had prior to the death of the decedent." I suggested to the people when Senator Chambers offered his amendment that if...they were telling correctly, if they were saying, I guess we used the word, "the truth", that there is no different right, then Senator Chambers amendment is completely consistent with the bill because it simply says, "no rights other than existed before", and I said because they are creating a different right the Chambers amendment basically gutted the bill, was completely contradictory. In the broadest construction of the Chambers amendment there can be no doubt that Senator Chambers' proviso is totally contradictory and repugnant to the purview or main body of the act because a new right is conferred in the main body of the act and all who have the type of claim set forth in the main body of the act could be construed as being creditors. I really ask you to read this Attorney General's opinion. Now I would go further. One of the things I have learned in this body in ten years is that sometimes if you will dig back into the past you discover things that would just surprise the heck out of you. I am going to give you one now. The original law, the original law that they are trying to reinstitute, the original law, when it was first presented, when it was first proposed, committee hearing, Mr. Chauncey Barney, attorney, Lincoln, appearing on behalf of the Nebraska Bankers Association spoke in opposition to the bill, advised the peculiar interest to the banker is the problem with deposits. Mr. Barney read before the committee three letters from the law firms of Morsman, Maxwell, Mike and Sawtell, Omaha; Beghtol, Mason and Anderson, Lincoln; Cline, Williams...

SPEAKER MARVEL: You have thirty seconds.

SENATOR DE CAMP: ...Wright and Johnson, Lincoln, voicing their opposition to legislation of this sort. Mr. Barney advised that if this law were passed, it would be at least ten years before anyone would understand what joint tenancy was. The savings and loans at that time also opposed this very proposition. I believe that you are effectively creating a monster with this bill. You are not affecting the properties. You can still dispose of that, but a year, eighteen months or two years later somebody who didn't even know there was a debt is personally liable under this bill, is personally sued and then Senator Beutler has the audacity to tell me why they have all the rights and defenses of whoever it was before. Eighteen months or two years later or one day or six months later, they don't even know about the