

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

January 25, 2000 LB 120

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Senator Redfield, we are...thank you, Mr. President. We are taking out the word because...considering the totality of the language that we're including in the committee amendment. We're going into the Parenting Act. The Parenting Act, it talks about what it shall include. But then it says...we're simply adding the words "specifically take into consideration"; later we're saying "with the goal of equalizing visitation". And all...over arching all of that is still a finding by the court upon hearing that it is in the best interests of the child. So we're using the same standard that the law has always used in arriving at the joint custody arrangement under the Parenting Act. I hope that's responsive. The key phrase is that the court must determine it is in the best interests of the child. So, even though we are urging joint custody, if the parents are irreconcilably unable to engage in a joint custody...

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: ...arrangement or to participate meaningfully in joint custody, that wouldn't be in the best interests of the child, all factors being considered. So the court really has to struggle with the same issue that courts always have to struggle with, and they are difficult issues, admittedly so. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Redfield, would you like the balance of your time?

SENATOR REDFIELD: Yes, I would, thank you very much. I still am not quite clear on why we have to take out that wording, why we could not leave the wording in that both parents would have to agree to this arrangement? Senator Brashear.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Thank you, Mr. President. Because it's the best interests of the child that's going to govern, not the parents. If you leave the agreement...have...both having to agree, you have not extended...you have given one parent the