

also the Attorney General's Office. I think we need to make sure that we use whatever talent is most expeditious at the time because the whole purpose of this is apparently to expedite child support payments and to make sure it is done on time and whatever.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, it depends on...I would think, Senator Lynch, that this would be a matter that would be good to discuss in January and in the clean-up bill deal with it if you want to deal with it, but as a matter of philosophy, what I would argue is that we should have the Attorney General's Office doing it rather than Social Services for the reason that I think you are going to get a lot more punch out of the Attorney General's Office, that people are going to be a lot more responsive, people who are not paying, a lot more responsive to threats from the Attorney General's Office than they are going to be to threats by the Department of Social Services. So as a matter of philosophy, I would like to make a definite statement preferring the Attorney General's Office to Social Services, and that is with a caveat that there should be some kind of careful transition here so that the programs that are going are not harmed.

SENATOR LYNCH: Well, I guess we could debate whether or not the muscle just identified because of the name Attorney General being used is more effective. Maybe you know more than I do. I wouldn't necessarily be more impressed with one than the other. I was simply concerned in the transition of all of this and, of course, it came up and I know that the rush involves us necessarily having to do these things but I am also concerned with the first four paragraphs. I am not quite sure what they mean, and in my own layman's mind I tried to determine what they are, and I know because we would like to accomplish all of this and get out of here on Friday, would it be too much to ask that we, just like yesterday when the amendments developed in the morning, to lay this over until the first thing this afternoon to give the Department of Social Services, the Attorney General's Offices, those of you who are interested in this bill the chance to understand a little more in detail the amendments? I certainly don't mean to imply, and I am not, that we are concerned about somebody trying to do something here that we think might, as Bill suggested, provide some authority in the Attorney General's Office or in the district or in the Supreme Court that we are not