

March 11, 1974

charge against the children's father. It stirs up emotions in the.....

(End of Belt 3A)

(Begin Belt 4A)

household. It creates turmoil in the household. It makes the ex-wife the bad person. While the dad is a great guy? He brings them flowers and candy from time to time but he does not provide the regular means of sustenance which the court ordered him to provide. Under LB961 the burden is upon the court to make him come into court and pay. If he does not, if his attorneys get him one continuance after another without any money being paid to the ex-wife. Then LB957 comes to play and we suspend his drivers license, Senator Fellman, I hope you will stop visiting long enough to listen to this...it's very important...we suspend his drivers license long enough only for that period of time when he might be engaged in frivolous driving activity. We allow him to drive to and from work. We do not interfere with his going to work. We'll allow him to drive in the nature of his employment to drive. If he needs to drive, if he's an insurance salesman, if he's a truck driver, we let him drive. The only thing we do, we say you shall not drive except in the nature of your employment. This is the further incentive towards his making his child support payments. And I would suggest to you, I would suggest to you that we need additional incentive to make these gentlemen pay. Now it has been charged and Senator Fellman says, if Senator Schmit does not support his children, he doesn't lose his drivers license. Well, let me tell you Senator Fellman, it's not all beer and pretzels for a man that's married and the father of ten children to support those children. There's a lot of times that those of us who are married would prefer not to go to work. There's a lot of times that we have other obligations and other responsibilities. There are a lot of times the crop didn't come in quite right or the business didn't work just right. It does not abrogate our responsibilities to our children. In fact, it perhaps it increases our responsibilities and it increases our incentive to provide for those children. Now, it has been said that we do not provide for extenuating circumstances for emergencies. The court can always provide for this. The court can always provide for this. The implication is that only divorced men get sick, only divorced men ever lose their jobs, only divorced men are for some unexplainable reasonable or reason unable to meet those obligations which they freely, which they freely, not under duress, accepted for themselves. I say this is not true. All of us have those obligations. The fact that a man is divorced does not remove one iota, one degree of that responsibility. Now Senator Fellman is concerned how we might look before the State of Nebraska, that we might look ridiculous. But I can tell you this, I have introduced another bill here LB834 which provides an increase in ADC payments, for children. I suggest, I suggest that those payments would not be as great as they are today by the State of Nebraska and the counties. If the ex-husband religiously and conscientiously made those payments which they owe to their ex-wives. I believe in responsibility. I believe in taking care of those individuals who cannot be taken care of but I have no recourse and I have no sympathy for those individuals who failed to accept their responsibility.