

to the judge? Does he talk to the clerk?

SENATOR BROMM: You mean...

SENATOR DIERKS: Do they come into the courtroom and then have another hearing? How does this all take place, this...

SENATOR BROMM: You mean right now, Senator Dierks?

SENATOR DIERKS: No, well, I would think with what Senator Day is trying to do with her amendment.

SENATOR BROMM: Okay. Well, as I read the amendment, the idea of it is to permit the party who wants to make a change in child support to fill out a form and an affidavit which would be available from the clerk of the court. And upon the filing of that with the court and notice given to the other spouse or the other party and to the county attorney, if there is child support involved that's being collected by the county or for Social Services, or something, upon those people being notified, the court would schedule a hearing on the...on the application and affidavit to determine whether or not there's been a material change in circumstances that would warrant a change in child support. It looks like it would be a process that could be accomplished without...without the use of an attorney in many cases. And that's...I think that's advantageous. It's pretty difficult, a lot of times, to do that now without the help of an attorney and kind of an expensive process as it stands right now.

SENATOR DIERKS: Thank you. I think, too, that this amendment may have some merit. I still have difficulty with the...with the bill. I think we've put a sugar coating on something that...and haven't gotten to the real issue. I think the real issue is the courts and the way that they handle the situation today. If they were able to do what we think they should do, we wouldn't be in this...we wouldn't be here talking about it today. But I wish we could address the court system and the way that they handle the situation and the different situations that come up, because every situation is different. They're not all alike and you can't paint them all with one brush and that's difficult for us to enact legislation without making it refer to everybody the same way. So I really think we ought to be looking at the judicial things that are going on and not exactly at what this bill is doing. I still have grave problems with