

then a notice is sent out. There is due process involved in here. If there is an error in it they can request an administrative hearing to contest the point of error. Where they can prove they paid their child support then the whole thing is dropped. After the administrative procedure, if they don't agree with that, they still have the ability to go to the district court and contest that. We have put a great deal of due process into this situation. It also deals with visitation interference. Currently we are going to allow the judge to take a driver's license for visitation interference and in 1997 we're going to put this in administrative process under the courts. We also have put in there a means that individuals who feel their child support is not something they can pay now, their situation has changed, a way for them to get back in the courts to a referee without having to hire an attorney. We've heard this complaint from the noncustodials many times so I think we are addressing some of the issues that they have brought up. This amendment becomes the bill, so it's important that you look at it and you understand what we're doing because the amendment will become the bill. We had questions last time on the rationale of license revocation. I just want to remind you that the government is who grants these license and if on one hand we are granting them licenses and on the other hand we are looking for them to fulfill a contract they have, I think that there is a rationale there to do this. There has been some question on the constitutionality of this and I think there's some things you need to look at with constitutionality. Usually there is three things and I'm not an attorney, but as I understand it there are three things that they deal with. First of all, it must contain procedural due process. There must be notification and opportunity to be heard and we have made sure this is in the legislation. There has to be equal protection which mean it generally focused on ensuring that people similarly situated will be treated similarly and we've done that. And it depends on the belief that license or a privilege are away, are right. The possession of professional or driver's license has never been considered a fundamental right by the Supreme Court. There has been some question on where the money goes. It's important to know that the main majority of money collected is non-AFDC cases which goes directly to the children and the women. I think that if we want to put children as a priority in this state, and most of us do, this is something that is very important. It's a very important preventative measure to welfare. It will help to some extent those that are currently on welfare, but the most important part is the preventative