

may such a transaction be done. The bank may not say, "Listen, I'm sorry, but we are not prepared to make this loan unless you get the signature of your spouse." This occurs in the place where a loan is being made to a credit worthy person based on securities and principals sufficient to guarantee the loan. What my point here is, is that the social policy argument of Senator Hoagland is not consistent with the rules and regulations which financial institutions are operating under at the present time. As a matter of fact, in regulation (b) is the equal opportunity credit regulation designed to protect the ability of individuals to have their own credit ratings. It was a response to in particular the women's lobby and others, divorced people and the like, who wanted the ability to have their own credit standings apply and in interpreting that regulation the comptroller has gone so far as to say a bank may not ask, let alone compel, a loan applicant for the signature of their spouse. I will hope that the rest of the debate this morning progresses without the idea that somehow the easy answer in this situation is for banks to simply say, "Listen, we will be happy to do it. Just bring in your wife", because the bank may not make that kind of a statement under current federal regulations.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Kahle.

SENATOR KAHLE: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I hate to get embroiled in a discussion of attorneys because I feel out of place but I guess I am quite concerned and amused at the statement that was handed out by the Commission on the Status of Women. I believe over the last number of years now we have all admitted that especially in our rural circumstances where farmland is involved and where a wife may spend forty years as my wife has with me and work together, up to the last few years she would receive very little from the property if it was not willed or some other position taken. When I listen to the debate here, you are talking about only a deceased spouse and I wonder how many times over the period of a lifetime that spouse borrows money to advantage of the other spouse. You are not talking about that. You are trying to make it more difficult for that to happen. The old boy might borrow \$20,000 and make \$50,000 to add to the joint tenancy in common wealth of that union and it is strange to see that the women want to be cut off from this. I thought they wanted in all the time. I thought they wanted to be a part of the partnership and I think they should be. I think it is wrong that we are not putting this together so that when one member of that union and that partnership borrows money that the other one can be