

March 7, 1974

explain it. Now we have several...I notice we have extension groups here visiting the Chamber and I think it would be a good project for them to study this particular bill in the coming bill. Because it's going to affect all of them...all of us. Now there's a great need for a probate reform and I think we have it in this bill. But, we have to have before I can vote for this bill, I have to have the support of my constituents. I'm representing them. I don't have one letter from any of my attorneys particularly favoring the bill but I have a letter written, I would have gotten it out but my secretary has had the flu this week, that they should read the bill and study it. Probably they have some seminars and sell this bill before asking us to vote for it. And, I think that's the situation of many of the senators here that we probably are in favor of the bill but our constituents are not. So let's do the spade work. Maybe we should lay this bill over until next session and in the meantime, all of us try to promote some kind of seminar so we understand it. That's all I have to say.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Nore. Next to speak is Senator John DeCamp.

SENATOR DE CAMP: Mr. President and members of the Legislature. There have been two serious questions raised here about the bill. Otherwise it's been pretty much talk about either we don't understand it or we can't understand it. And so I'd like to address myself to those two points which may have created some confusion or doubt in the minds of some members of the Legislature and to the best of my ability simplify it or give you a simple explanation. The two points are the \$35,000 which Senator Carstens raised which Senator Luedtke discussed with him and I think that may have confused some people, the discussion on it. And the other point raised by Senator Carstens was the aspect that trusts would come more into existence under this bill. You see, the truth is that Senator Carstens is exactly correct on both of these points and that's good that these things will come about. For example, the \$35,000 aspect merely guarantees that the widow or widower, the man or wife or husband or wife, would be guaranteed in the case of death at least a minimum of \$35,000 or the first \$35,000 of an estate. And I think that the impression that was tried to.....

(End of Belt #7)

(Begin Belt #8)

be conveyed to the Legislature was maybe this is terrible. Maybe the husband wants all the money to go to the children. And yet under this new bill the wife or the husband is going to be guaranteed that they're going to get at least the first \$35,000. Well, is that so terrible? After spending whatever amount of life they spend together before one or the other dies, it seems reasonable that the widow or widower should have a certain claim, a fixed amount minimum before they're thrown out into the cold so to speak. Let us assume that in today's inflation and the continuing inflation I think you can expect for the next couple of years, that you or your wife dies and you have to get by until whatever time you can become self sufficient, particularly if you're a widow, and you haven't had any previous work experience. \$35,000 isn't going to be the greatest amount in the world. Okay, the other point Senator Carstens brought up is that trusts are going to