

as it has in its mutilated, misunderstood condition is because of the powerful banking interests that have been twisting arms. Now I gave Senator Beutler a copy of the committee hearing transcript and he has said things on the floor which were different from what Mr. Brandt said when he offered the bill to the committee. Senator Beutler also said in the newspaper and I talked to him about it the other day if the paper misquoted him or if I am misrepresenting he has the opportunity to correct it, that he had no idea of what all this bill involved and I think he even indicated that he may not have brought it in had he understood all of the ramifications. I don't think Senator Beutler, the introducer, understands the bill now. The reason I say it, he got a letter from the Bar Association offering an entirely new section to the bill and that letter is dated yesterday and Senator Beutler now has on our desks a proposition to incorporate that into the bill. So if Mr. Brandt had told him the truth and understood the bill, if Senator Beutler had studied it and understood it, it would not be necessary to make these radical or substantive changes in the bill on Final Reading. If this twisted, misrepresented piece of legislation becomes law and problems do result, I don't think the legislators should then say, we didn't understand what we were doing. It is clear that the bill is not understood now. Even if this amendment that Senator Beutler is offering which the Bar Association drafted and the Bar Association's imprimatur does not make it sacred to my way of thinking. We have a hodgepodge, the main thrust of which is to deny widows and orphans solace and sustenance after the death of a husband who may have contracted debts which were probably even questionable in the first place. The reason I would say to kill the bill besides the appeals to the welfare of the widows and orphans is the fact that it is a major piece of legislation. It alters a substantial portion of the law in a substantial fashion and it is not understood. Those who are supporting it are saying contrary things. There is even a letter from the Department of Justice which was delivered to Senator DeCamp and from reading the letter Senator DeCamp may have phrased his questions in such a way as to elicit a statement that the bill is unconstitutional as a result of an amendment that I offered. My amendment simply said the creditors would have no rights after death than they had before. Now Senator Beutler doesn't like that amendment because he says the bill is not designed to give creditors rights after death that they had before but this language, although it says they won't have rights after death than they had before, should not be attached to the bill which would indicate that they are trying to give the creditors rights after death other than those they had before. My good friend, Senator Landis, who usually is on target made some misrepresentations, I think, because Mr.