

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 10, 1999 LB 612

SENATOR BAKER: Thank you. Thank you, Senator Beutler. I understand your example there but in reality I really don't think, as tough as it is to get into farming, that anybody is probably going to do that as a means to avoid child support, I really don't. I guess what we're looking for with this bill is some uniformity in those cases. That same person could be farming, and if we don't pass this bill, all he has to do is lease the equipment, which, in your case, an 80-acre farm, I would think he would just go out and lease it, which is a deduction, not depreciation. So there's...we can...I can probably write down, I'll bet Senator Kremer and I can write down a dozen different ways we can get around adjusted gross income and without farming too, so we're looking for some...some uniformity in this and I hate to continually use a farming operation, as such. It's anybody, of course, who's...has any self-employment income and files a Schedule C, so it could be anyone that does this. I'm...what...I guess what we're going to look at over the summer is to bring some accountability to the custodial parent. I have had a lot of input from this bill as it advanced last time. There seems to be not only this problem, lack of uniformity on depreciation between judges, but also there's a bigger problem out there and that's accountability to those...of the custodial parent, and that's a problem we're going to work on over...between sessions here, is trying to get some accountability when that child support payment is made that it actually goes to the benefit of those children. I know that's a big problem. Everybody brings that up. But my bill specifically addresses the fact that depreciation is a legitimate expense and I would really not think that anybody would go out, in order to avoid child support, and farm. They might go out and buy a new copy machine or something, a self-employed person, but does that answer your questions?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, Senator, I mean yes and no. You indicated that the example wasn't very probable, but the example I gave you was almost the fact situation from the Supreme Court case of Rauch v. Rauch. And this was the case, it may or may not engendered whoever came to you with this bill. I...I'm not sure what the mechanics were. Maybe the bill came from you yourself. Some people don't believe that's possible that senators have their own ideas, but...but I know differently. But, anyway, this case, Rauch v. Rauch, that was the fact