

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

April 19, 1999 LB 637

SENATOR MATZKE: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I want to address three issues that I think apply to this motion to bracket. First, let's look at the experience that some Nebraskans have actually had with this type of procedure. Colorado has it, it's run by a major national corporation that's listed on the New York Stock Exchange. I live 16 miles from Colorado. The counties that border Colorado deal with the Colorado judicial system all the time, because we have employees living in Nebraska that move across the line into Colorado, may work for in Colorado for a while, then move back. And many child support problems therefore involve employers in Colorado. The experience of our county attorneys, who have to deal with the Colorado system, is a real indictment of their system. They receive no responses, they find records of misapplication of payments of child support in the records that they finally get. So the experience shows that this computer system is not the answer, it will create more problems than it will solve. Second issue I want to address is the time turn around. Many counties will hold checks for ten days, to make sure that they are not stuck with a bad check. The statement has been made that this will...this will cause the turn around time to be shortened. It often takes two to three days to mail a letter from western Nebraska to Lincoln, I run into that problem with my office staff all of the time. It takes two or three days to get a letter to Lincoln, it takes another day or two to process it, and two or three days to send the check back to somebody in the western half of the state. You're not gaining any time at all, and that's an argument that is not persuasive. But, thirdly, we come to really the central issue, and what we're talking about is cost. We're talking about is it worth the amount of money that we might be penalized to remain in control of our own court system or not. And Senator Bourne has analyzed the figures, and I think his statement was that what we're really talking about is about \$8 million a year. The fact of the matter is that under LB 142 we're going to funnel back to the counties \$13 million more than they previously received. We've actually paid the counties already to do this. Even though there may be some offsetting budgetary matters, the counties are going to reap a windfall out of LB 142 that is just about exactly equal to the amount of money that it takes to run this program. And I say that if we do lose the federal money, our counties are still going to be in about an equal financial position. Personally,