

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

January 25, 2000 LB 120

potential amendments to LB 120 in its current form, then I'm going to vote, on General File, to advance this bill so we can lengthen out the time frame to consider it. And on Select File, if the bill is not in a form that moves forward the kinds of goals I want to have, which is more recognition and more attention to child visitation and parenting without heavy presumptions, I'm going to vote against the bill. I'm going to use this deliberative process for a period of time to see if there is a way to move public policy forward. There are a couple of nuggets in this bill that do that, there are some things that don't do that, and I'm going to allow for the wheat and the chaff, hopefully, to get mixed a little more sensitively before I vote for the bill. But I'm going to allow the bill to live, as far as I'm concerned, to let that discussion go forward. Senator Brashear, gets the remainder of his time back.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Two and a half minutes left, Senator Brashear.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Landis. I'm going to continue to oppose the Chambers amendment. I'm going to stay the course. I've not been persuaded and I'm sorry or I'm not but, nevertheless, I've not been persuaded. When we say that it is impossible to equalize visitation time among parents for children of tender age, take that statement, it is impossible to equalize visitation as between parents of ten...as between parents for children of tender age, then don't do it. It's not in the best interest of the child. If you're going to trust judges to do all the other things they do, if it's impossible to equalize parenting time as between parents with children of tender age, don't do it, and this bill doesn't mandate it. If you can't force people to get along, don't try. You don't do joint custody when people can't get along. It says in the bill...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR BRASHEAR: ...in plain English that we're asking the court to take into consideration, that's all, take into consideration consistent with the best interests of the child. It later says in plain English, with the goal of equalizing, not "thou shalt", but with the goal of equalizing. I think I've got