

told us that this provision that you are trying to put into the law was inadvertently omitted from the... Brandt: Uniform Probate Code. Chambers: Inadvertently deleted. Do you think it was really an inadvertence? Brandt: I think very definitely." And then he goes on to talk about bank accounts and so forth and information has been handed around by several people to show that the issue was specifically addressed by those dealing with the Uniform Probate Code and they knew what they were doing. There are other matters in this testimony which I think if Senator Beutler had read, he might disagree with or he has forgotten some of the things he has said on the floor and as far as intellectual arrogance is concerned, we know, each of us, what we ought to think about our own ability. So if some people lack the confidence in themselves that I have in mine, that is not my problem and on this floor I am going to continue to discuss issues in the way my style requires me to discuss them and other people if they are more inclined to be aloof and retiring and shy and somewhat apologetic, that is the approach they have chosen to take but when you inject a controversial issue onto this floor for debate you wcn't be able to remain aloof. When heat is generated there may be some singeing to the hindquarters and other parts and as to what Senator Landis said, I listened to him pretty well. In fact, I probably listen to him better than I do to some of the other senators because Senator Landis has a flair to what he says. Now, if he was not trying to put into the discussion the talk of federal regulations related to discrimination and the granting of credit there was no point for him to make the comments that he made which parallels some remarks that Mr. Brandt made before the committee. There was no need to send that information around and so that the body and the record will be clear on that issue as I addressed it, I was saying that a prudent banker or any lender who expects to consider property as the means of securing a loan should inquire as to how that property is held, whether it is held in fee simple by a joint tenancy with rights of survivorship or whatever and because of the approach that I took Senator Landis' offering of the particular federal regulations that he brought up had no relationship whatsoever to what I said. There is no federal regulation that prevents a bank or any other lender from inquiring as to how property is owned especially when that property is to be used to secure a loan. Now as far as my working with the Bar Association, I told Senator Beutler why I did not want to work with them. He probably forgot what I told him but I mentioned that there were other issues very serious which I had talked to the Bar Association about. I had been given promises as to studies and other work they were going to do on a particular issue and to this date, such things have never been done. I had a bill before the Judiciary Committee just so you will know that I am not talking about a nonexistent something I am