

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 10, 2000 LB 1021

Now, that's a policy decision, and if you don't like that, then you can tell us so. But it was the feeling of the group that that was probably the best way to look at gifts. And then finally, the third change is over on the last page of your handout, clear down at the bottom there where it talks about relatives. And in the current statutes, and in the first amendment, the relative remains undefined. But now, thanks to Senator Wickersham, we have a much broader definition which includes spouse, father, mother, stepparent, grandfather, grandmother, brother, sister, son, daughter, stepchild, child or children legally adopted, among others. It even goes on a little bit further than that. If they've lived with you for ten years they are considered to be immediate family. So those are the three substantive changes that the group worked out based on the discussion on the floor. And at this time I would yield any of my time to Senator Wickersham. Senator, did you wish a little time to speak about this?

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Wickersham, you're recognized.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Mr. President. There are a couple of comments I would make that I think go to aspects of interpretation of the amendment that is before us. Senator Schimek noted that the definition on page 2 of a relative is broader than the definition of an individual's immediate family. That is certainly true. For the most part that definition came from the inheritance tax statutes, and it is, for the most part, the definition that you'll find for the category of individuals entitled to a \$10,000 exemption from the inheritance tax. It has been broadened a little bit in some respects, but that is where the basic language came from. I had an individual come to me this morning and ask whether or not in-laws were included within the definition. That person did not want to make in-laws into outlaws, I think, and there is no intention with the language in the definition to make outlaws out of in-laws. It is my view that the concluding phrase "or spouse or surviving spouse of any such persons" modifies all of the previous categories so that in-laws would not be outlaws under the definition as you see it. There is one other place that I would suggest that at least my intent is that when an agency, political subdivision or publicly funded postsecondary educational institution gives a gift of an admission to a