

the mediation. So what my amendment does is say that this obligation of the mediator to report abuse as required by law would be stricken from this section of the bill. I don't know how to make it any clearer, but if you have questions as to why I'm trying to do this perhaps I have not made that clear and I'm prepared to answer those questions. But in reviewing any attempted amendment to this bill or any criticism of it, the question has to be asked, is this bill, if it passed, likely to improve the conditions under which children live after their parents have divorced? I don't see anything in it that necessarily ensures that. I was just reading an article that described a case that was handed down by Senator Kristensen's court, otherwise known as the Appellate Court. There was a lady and there was a man and they could not make it so they went their separate ways and the lady was given custody of two children. Being a strong religious person, she felt that if the children did not go to Mass on Sunday it was mortal sin, and if you commit mortal sin, that is awfully, awfully bad. See, children who get burned out on religion, if they choose not to go to church, will be burned up after they leave this world and, not wanting that to happen, the mother went to court, one of these little courts out there in western Nebraska some place and the judge, probably seeing the importance of religion, agreed with the mother and she told...he told the father either you make sure these kids go to Mass or you take them back on Saturday evening so she can be sure they go to Mass early Sunday morning. Why don't you want them to go to Mass anyway? And he probably said, because I think church is a mass of confusion. But, in any case, the judge ruled against the father and for the mother. It went to the Appellate Court and, Senator Kristensen, I have to give credit where it's due, in this case the judges made a judicious decision. They said that to compel this man to do what the lower court said would have to be done is to place the court's seal of approval upon her opinion that the children's failure to go to church when not in her custody is a sinful thing and the court would not do that. In view of a total absence of any evidence that their not going to church was going to hinder them or be harmful in any way, the court could not make a determination as though that type of evidence were before them, so they said that that lower court decision would be overturned. The father would not have to give up a substantial amount of the time of his visitation and he did not have to make those children go to church. The father stated that he did not discourage them from going to church, but there were some times other activities had conflicted and the children