

March 7, 1974

what's in some of these letters that I've received. Now, here's a letter from one of my constituents. He had to have his step-father's estate probated and this was a small estate but it cost 10% of the appraised value of the state for the attorney's fee. That was in 1957 and this letter is dated in January of this year and urging us to get along with some type of probate reform and this same estate is going through probate again and they're taking 25%. Now, he says that the only thing he can do is to pay the fee and feel that he was robbed. So we have two groups of people that have opposed this probate reform from the beginning and I want to name those two groups. The first group, I think, were the newspaper people and there was some misunderstanding. They felt that all notices of estates was going to be done away with. I would like to quote from an editorial in a paper that was against editorial and it was written by a county judge and he addresses himself to the question of the notice. And he says the question is not and never has been whether public notices should be abolished. It is one of determining the best number and forms of notice consistent with the sometimes conflicting concerns of speedy economical and private distribution of estates and assurances that all interested parties are given an opportunity to protect their interest. Now, there has been a lot of resistance from attorneys. But now this group that was appointed by the Nebraska Bar Association and headed by Judge Troyer, 22 members, and some of those people went into the study of this bill, opposed to it. And after they got through, they thoroughly understand the bill. Most of those people are very much in favor of this bill. Now, there's one other thing I want to take out of this editorial and this judge addressed himself this legislation isn't for the benefit for either publishers or lawyers. It is for every person who expects to die, who is related to someone who will die, or who is owed money by someone who will die. Anyone fitting into this category should be interested enough in the bill to find out what it will do for them before opposing its passage. Well, of course, that includes all of us, I think. Now, Senator Carstens said this was a very important bill and I agree with that 100%. Because sooner or later it's going to affect all of us and our families. Now, I as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I went out through the state with the committee and there were objections but I think through these amendments we corrected most of those. I would urge the members of this Legislature to pass this bill forward and when we get it over on Final Reading, the thing will be in final form and we can study it and I'm sure that some of the attorneys that now oppose it will be in favor of it. I would like to say this that there's many attorneys in my district that oppose this. And it's pretty hard for me to get up here and say let's advance this bill when I know some of those people oppose it. But on the other hand I have some people who have made a thorough study of it and they're urging me to push for the passage of this bill. I thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator Stull. Next to speak is Senator Whitney and then Senator Schmit.

SENATOR WHITNEY: Mr. President and members of the Legislature. I really don't think it's necessary for us to speak too much on this bill because I don't think anybody understands it anyway. And so I feel we'd ought to get right on and vote pretty quick and then decide what to do on the basis of that. Now, with so many amendments that have come up and with the fact that most of my lawyers, in fact all of them that have