

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

March 17, 1999

LB 612

have to bear up under. (Laugh) It must have...if that's a troubling fact, Senator Baker, it must not have been a compliment to you to have it suggested that you were representing the party very well. In any event, I would also like to support the bracket motion. And, related to what Senator Pederson said, I think the reason that there are so many lawyers standing here and arguing for the bracket motion is not because we've been lobbied by anybody, because I haven't heard from anybody on this bill except a couple of individuals, but it's just the fact that in many cases what the Legislature ends up doing, and it's wise that we do it, is to state a general principle to be followed in a particular area or subject matter area and then, as best we can, we leave it to the court to start defining how that general principle should be applied to a myriad, to 10,000 different situations that exist out there. And that we've found over time that court-made law in certain areas is a better way of going about making the law because there are so many situations that you cannot anticipate and where a general rule applied by the Legislature would result...would have a bad result. The general rule that's being espoused by Senator Baker, for example, I think would have a bad result in this fact situation of Rauch v. Rauch, which was decided by the Supreme Court not so long ago, and in that case depreciation was added back in. It was an odd fact situation. It was a guy trying to farm 80 acres and they said buying equipment to farm that 80 acres wasn't a reason to decrease your child support amount. He was also a truck driver. I think the court was absolutely right in that case. How Senator Baker's broad rule would apply in that case I think would not be a desirable result. There are other cases you could imagine out there and these unusual cases eventually come up, situations where a wife, a second wife, is wealthy and the guy doesn't have to do anything, so he chooses just to lose money on a farm. Can he argue that he should pay no child support? I don't think he should be able to argue that. Anyway, it's, by way of example, offering to you the suggestion, which I think is true, that you ought to be very careful about applying a general broad concept when you know that life is going to present you with situations that will result in an unfair application and probably then an appeal to the Legislature for a distinction to the rule and ad nauseam appeal through time back to the Legislature time and time again for further distinctions and clarifications,