

March 11, 1974

need to have it done but I will do so because I believe the issue was critical and I want to be able to document that which I have asked you to support. First of all, the ex-wife, the mother of the children must retain an attorney. In order to do so, if an attorney wants to pay his rent and feed his own children and eat himself, he must demand of the ex-wife a retainer. Now, it has been my experience in visiting with most of these women that they do not have 150 or 250 dollars with which to retain an attorney. In most cases they do not seek out an attorney until they are destitute and desperate and therefore, they are unable to retain an attorney. If they do retain an attorney and they do not have the money, there is only one alternative if the attorney is going to eat and again I'm watching out for the attorneys because I do want them to eat regularly. They must take the case on a contingency basis. So the attorney and I'm sure my attorney friends can point out my technical problems in outlining these problems because I'm a farmer and not an attorney, but the attorney files a complaint. The complaint then results in the attorney and the ex-wife going to court. They assign a time for deliberation, they deliver notice to the ex-husband, if he has any kind of attorney at all and he usually does, he gets a continuance. He's unable to be there at that time, he's sick, he's got a bad back, he's got the bellyache, he's got the headache. He's out of town on a job and the rascal hasn't worked for months. In many cases, time after time after time, the thing can be continued. I've talked to attorneys who've had three and four continuances, each time the ex-wife's lawyer has to appear in court. Each time the wife has to in many cases take time from her job to appear in court to no avail. The ex-wife can be owed thousands of dollars in back child support and the ex-husband comes to court and offers her \$50 or \$100 on a bill totaling thousands or maybe more, maybe tens of thousands of dollars. And so what happens? They say well if you throw the guy in jail, he's not going to be able to pay anything, we know that. So they say well let's keep bringing him in, let's bring him in and see if we can't get something out of him. So finally he consents to pay \$100 on a bill of \$5,000 and then he agrees to come back in a few weeks and pay another few hundred dollars. And so when the time comes, even though a contempt charge has been filed against him, he doesn't appear. And so the mother or the attorney has to file the contempt plea or the contempt charge, then he very laggardly comes into court, usually with the money. Often times not. In any case the situation is in the position where the ex-wife has to always be playing catch up, catch up, catch up. Now in order for you properly to understand LB957, you have to understand Senator Fellman's own bill, LB1051, LB1015, pardon me, which provides for garnishment of wages. That's fine if the guy's working. If he's not working, if he has other means of income, what are you going to do? You're not going to garnishee a salary check which he does not have. You have to also understand LB961 which does this and I hope the President will indulge me in allowing me to explain why the two bills work together. LB961 provides for the Clerk of the Court to maintain the records. It also provides that when there's a delinquency, the district judge appoints an attorney (you see I'm again taking care of the attorneys), I'm going to allow them to be appointed by the court. The ex-husband if he has resources will pay them. He will pay the attorney. If he has no resources, the county will pay him. This is the major difference. The attorney knows he's going to be paid so he's going to take the case. The burden is off the ex-wife. It's solved the problem that frequently exists, when children are involved and the ex-wife brings the