

get the child support that is owed to the children and the families that are in need paid, we sometimes have to ask the question in our zeal to get that money to where it is supposed to go, are we, in fact, going to create other areas that are even more difficult and cause more confusion in our attempt to try to do what was right. One of the points that Senator Chambers is making, and I wholeheartedly agree with, and that is when you set up two areas of subjective areas, where you could have 20 different cases, even you could have the same case in theory tried 20 different times, you could get 20 different decisions made, because you have 20 different people that would be looking at it. When you have that, you are going to have a case in Nebraska where if a person X says, here is the case that I have, here is the situation that I was under and this is what happened. Another person has the same kind of circumstances, goes, and the exact opposite happens. The frustration that would build, because there is no consistency, I think would be tremendous on that point. When we go and set policy in trying to get the dollars where they need to be, we also want to make sure that that process we set up is not going to be more confusing and cause more problems or an equal number of problems that we already have, and I think that is what we have in the bill at this particular point. Senator Chambers' amendment is not that harmful to the bill as far as setting up the process, in fact it does make a lot of sense on the areas of total subjectivity we have. But whenever you have decisions made just on subjectivity that is fine, but when you have it set up in a case of this nature with people who may or may not be deadbeats, it does, I think, cause another set of problems and another set of concerns that I think people will be asking us, why did we do that? Why didn't we set up a process that was very clear-cut, and I don't have an answer for that right now. This process that we have now in the bill is not clear-cut, it is not straightforward and it does not set clear guidelines, and Senator Chambers' amendment would take that out. That is not to say that once we make a decision to take it out, I think what the vote on this amendment is, do we like the subjectivity of it, and if we don't, we should take it out. That is not to say that Senator Day and others can not come back with an amendment to say, well, you didn't like the subjectivity on it, here is something that is more direct, that is very much more black and white, and then we can consider that. But let's don't just simply advance something that is subjective and causes more difficulty in our zeal to try to get the dollars where they need to go, which is what all of us would like to do.