

but not totally. Now I think Senator Hoagland has explained this before, but I'm going to try it again, my way. What they have done is said we are going to give you a grace period and if you are in compliance then we'll go ahead. But if you are not in compliance you're going to pay a penalty. The penalty is going to be loss of money. So this is why we are going for September 1 in the bill because the federal government is saying you've got to be in compliance. Right now we have it that when someone becomes delinquent in child support you don't go after them until afterwards. What the federal government wants us to do is do it automatically, garnishee their wages. We have, in our law now, to garnishee the wages. What we don't have is the masters, those who will be hearing child support laws five days a week and bringing in hundreds of thousands of dollars, hopefully, because we won't be doing it in the largest county in the state only one-half of a day of the week. So we are still talking about the loss of \$4.7 million, \$4,700,000. We've got to pass the bill this year so that we can show the federal government we now have the law the way the federal government wants it, and we are moving towards the position that we have to be in. That is the best explanation I can give. I think it is logical. I wonder if there is anybody here that objects, if there is anybody here paying child support maybe who objects to the idea that instead of waiting until a parent is 30 days behind or 60 days past due in paying child support, that we have it in the law that they don't have to go back to court and say, judge, he or she is behind in child support. The masters can automatically order then garnishment of wages when they are not paying. The man or the woman who has the care of the children will be getting the money much faster. Now the plan that I had in mind, that I hope I never ever have to use,...

SPEAKER NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR HIGGINS: ...is to ask judges, since they only will give a half a day a week for child support cases, to start going to work as early as the rest of the people and start court at eight o'clock in the morning and go to five instead of start at eight-thirty, knock off at noon, take two hours for lunch, go back and quit at four-thirty. Maybe we need to mandate their hours. If there is something in the Constitution that says we can't do that, there is a way of getting their attention and that is pay them by the hour.