

May 2, 1995

LB 592

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...that even though this bill is very broad in its sweep and takes a meat-ax approach toward those who are deemed to be delinquent on child support, they may not actually be. Before you do something that may cause harm to that individual, a harm which may not be undone, you should be very careful and know that there is a liability that you are going to place upon yourself if you do not act in a very careful, prudent, circumspect manner, whoever that individual turns out to be. And I would work with Senator Lindsay to see if we can pinpoint such a person. I would support an amendment of the kind that he has in mind. There are arguments galore given by those who support 592 in terms of its ultimate...

SPEAKER WITHEM: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...goal.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Bromm, followed by Senators Lindsay, Day, and Chambers.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senator Lindsay, following up on Senator Beutler's comments, I guess I would like to know if you intend to pursue this amendment to the end at this point, or look further at it, withdraw it, and try to offer it on Select. I have some concerns about the way it is worded at the present time.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Senator Bromm, I've looked at it. I went back after Senator Beutler raised the issue, and the person that it's, that it is not hitting the administrative law judge, contrary to what Senator Beutler refers to. It is referring to the person who requests that certification, or who does the certification, which is the authorized, authorized attorney or the director, whoever is pursuing the case, and that would be in Section 18 on page 7 of AM1026. That is who we will be referring to. We are not referring to the administrative law judge. That does not appear at all in the amendment, and to further on that, I will state unequivocally, for the record, that is not the intent to place any liability on the ALJ at all. It simply is not the case, and I don't think it is written that way. After reviewing it again and looking at the amendment, it is not referring to that administrative hearing officer, so I do intend to run it as is.