

that those opposing the bill have known much less about what the bill contained than those proposing it and just on a personal note and I don't like to get into this sort of thing very often, but now Senator Chambers is standing up here arguing about his amendment and its effect and Senator Chambers says I have been fooled, that I wasn't smart enough to figure out what was in the bill and I guess I wonder about Senator Chambers' intellectual arrogance and I wonder if that hasn't led him to that conclusion and I am beginning to wonder about his own intellectual honesty. The last time we were on the floor on this amendment I said, okay, put the Chambers' amendment on and I stated here on the floor that it was broad sweeping language and that it was not possible to analyze in a few minutes on the floor what the implications of that amendment might be and I said that I would work with him in good faith to work out language, if this language was not suitable, to work out language which would have the same effect of what he intended to do. The other day I went with him. I went to Senator Chambers and I asked him to meet with the Bar Association to work out language that was suitable. You have in front of you now a letter from the Bar Association indicating that the Chambers' amendment is not acceptable. Senator Chambers refused to work with the Bar Association, with the people interested in the bill, and I must say quite frankly that I am very disappointed in that.

SPEAKER MARVEL PRESIDING

SPEAKER MARVEL: You have one minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: I think we go back again to the very beginning and I think I just have to make the basic point again because that is what it is all about. If you incurred debt, you should pay the debt and the form of the ownership should not make any difference and I go back again to the analogy with divorce law. If a man or a woman are settling in a divorce case, in determining how much the man gets and how much the woman gets, we don't look to see if the property is in joint tenancy with right of survivorship or whether it is in tenancy in common. We don't look at the forms on the deeds. We look at the realities. Who contributed? Who owes? And again, I am asking the same thing with 306. Look at the realities. If the decedent contributed, then why shouldn't that portion that he contributed be used to pay the debt? Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Schmit. Senator Schmit, do you wish to speak to the Marsh motion?

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, my views on the bill are well known. I oppose the bill and I