

March 7, 1974

come into existence. Well, I don't think there's any doubt under this bill that we'll see more trusts being formed. But let's look into that just a little further. With the development of federal tax laws over which this Legislature has no control, trusts are the most effective way for me or you or anybody to try to get a sizable amount of the earnings they've made or the property they've developed during their life to their children and make sure it gets there or makes sure it gets to the place they want it without being completely destroyed by inheritance and estate and other tax. Now, I'm not going to give you an 8-hour explanation of trusts or anything of the kind. I can say that I think the law schools and those who specialize in estates and really know estate planning utilize the trust for the benefit and protection of their client probably as much or more as any other device that is being developed today. This is for the benefit of the client. Now, Senator Carstens suggested, for example, that while if we have trusts he link that up somehow with the takeover of conglomerate farming. This seems to me, no offense intended, to reek of the same type of argument like we find kids on the campus using drugs or marijuana and we go back and we see that they also lived in a community that fluoridated water and we say there's no doubt about it, everytime we expand this fluoridation, it leads to drugs. In other words, it doesn't really follow. It just isn't linked up. Yes, more trusts will be used and yes, the wife or the husband who survives will be guaranteed at least a sizable portion of the estate. But these are not bad things, they are good. I think they're what the members of this Legislature and the people of this state probably want. Now, about understanding the bill or going through a point by point explanation of the bill, you spend three years in law school taking courses on it and then I suppose the average attorney who really becomes competent and skilled in a state practice and probate probably spends another five to ten years before he really knows his way through that. It seems a little hopeless then that I or Senator Luedtke or Senator Carstens or any lawyer in this Body is going to be able in the next four hours or four days or four months to completely explain all the aspects of the bill. And we get back to what Senator Fellman said, you have to take a little bit of it on faith. Contact your attorney but make sure he's read it. Read some attorney or some judge you really respect, ask him. The bill as it has been worked out now, I think, is probably satisfactory to any competent honest person involved in a state planning and a state practice. The argument was made against the bill that we had 117 amendments. This sounds bad on its face except that you members of the Legislature have dealt with bills before. You know that sometimes to effect one change, one small technical change in a bill, it could take a dozen amendments to change a word or something. So this is not indicative of anything other than we spend an awful lot of time working out all the foreseeable problems that can be worked out at this time. And I would urge you to advance the bill. I think it's what you want and definitely what the people of Nebraska want.

PRESIDENT: Thank you, Senator DeCamp. Next to speak, Senator Leslie Stull. Then Senator Whitney.

SENATOR STULL: Mr. President and members of the Legislature. I would like to point out that the push for this bill came from the people. Last year I received a number of letters, in fact, more letters on this subject than any other subject that we've ever had in the Legislature. And it's the people that wants probate reform. And I would like to just read from one of the letters, not read but point out the content of