

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

May 31, 2005

LB 116

Legislature, LB 116 advanced from the Judiciary Committee, unanimous vote, I believe one absent. LB 116 allows the court to sanction an employer or other payor for failing to withhold and remit the income of a person obligated to comply with a court order. The language, if you look in your...on your gadgets, as you can see, is fairly permissive in nature. Although most employers respect garnishment orders for child support, there have been instances where some employers who, for whatever reason, don't satisfy those court orders. I guess the bad apples, if you will, are the reason that I offer LB 116. We heard in the Judiciary Committee hearing on the bill that our state presently has some custodial parents who are struggling financially to make ends meet because child support payments are not being withheld and remitted by the employer of the noncustodial parent. These employers are disrespecting both our courts and the children for whom they have issued a garnishment order. Now, some states, Minnesota...I wouldn't say that this potential legislation mirrors Minnesota but it's fairly close. Some states in the Midwest--Iowa, North Dakota, Missouri--hold employers personally, I guess, liable for the amount of unpaid support due in addition to possible fines or court costs. LB 116 does not do that. The bill merely seeks to impose a \$25 per day penalty for up to \$500 per incident on an employer who fails to comply with a garnishment order. It addresses avoiding the statutes and perhaps might be the financial incentive needed to gain compliance from the aforementioned employers. The Minnesota law, I believe, and this one, like I said, it doesn't mirror it, but it's fairly close. Minnesota Statute 393-07, adopted in 2003, the pertinent language: may sanction an employer or payor of funds \$25 per day, up to \$500 per incident. The committee amendment that will follow, Senator Bourne will follow up with that, incorporates a few other Judiciary Committee items, issues I guess we'd call them, some bills, and I would appreciate the support on those as well. I'd appreciate the support we've received so far on LB 116. Treasurer's Office, Ron Ross, was helpful in moving this through committee, and also just from constituents and interested parties. With that, I would say...I would thank you for the consideration of this matter. I would ask for the advancement of LB 116 when the time comes. Thank you.