

know, that they call me and tell me that makes no sense, has no flexibility, allows no changes. That they, as soon as they make this decision to divorce that they are immediately thrown into this system, and that those are where the changes need to be made. So given that that's the feeling, generally, of the majority of people that are in this system, wanting to address the issue of child support and the issue of visitation, because that comes up too. And you have to admit, people, you have heard, people call you, because they've called me that they're having problems with their visitation. It's often used as a, you know, holding...a holding point to get money. Or, you know, there's even the case of people who give their ex-spouses money that's not reported, in order to get on some of the programs...other programs that we have in the state. You have to admit this occurs. So, given all of this, and given that today we're supposed to be trying to solve the issue of nonpayment of child support, or at least increasing that 20 percent, even the top state, regardless of what they do in Minnesota, is at 38 percent, even if we can increase that, or at least try something like this to increase that, I'm willing to give this a try to see how much we can increase it without the bureaucratic approach at this time and give my amendment a chance to, you know, for a year or two to see how that would affect these percentages and the individuals involved in it without affecting...you know, tangling them up into a web of rules and regulations. But I realize that when we came here this morning that this kind of came upon us pretty quickly. And I know that there needs to be a lot more discussion on this issue and on the possibilities of an amendment like mine,...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR WITEK: ...as opposed to something like 592. So at this time, I will be pulling my amendment from 592. Although, after you've had more time to discuss 592, itself, I will more than likely be reintroducing my amendment so that you will still have an opportunity, before you vote this bill forward, to take a look at both of those suggestions, one, the very heavy-handed bureaucratic approach, and one a very simplistic approach within the court system to allow the judge to make a decision, which it would not take any extra time or effort to make this decision. And then you'll have a chance to decide at that time on which way you want to go for at least the time being, and maybe give this a chance. So I will be withdrawing my amendment from 592