

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

January 27, 2000 LB 120

deleted. So it says, and consideration should be given to joint custody, not first consideration. So there has been a de-emphasis, obviously, on the importance of that consideration. And secondly, in front of the word "custody", we've injected the word "legal", "legal custody". And that's intended to highlight a concept that is further highlighted at the top of the next page. And that is the difference between legal custody and physical custody. And I think there's a lot of confusion on the floor and in people's minds about that. And part of the confusion comes from the statutes themselves, which don't, I think, sufficiently distinguish the concept of physical custody from the concept of legal custody. So what we've done, before going back to that a little bit, what we've done here is limited this concept to legal custody, that is, joint plans that had to do with the decision-making process, deciding important things in the child's life, doing those things together, legal, joint custody. Having legal, joint custody does not at all necessarily mean that there is going to be a kind of physical joint custody. I think in many people's minds they think joint custody means the kid is going to be in one house three days of the week, and in the other house four days of the week. That's never been in anybody's mind in the best interest of a child. Judges have traditionally fixed physical custody in one home or the other on the theory that I think most of us agree with, that the stability of having one primary residence is what almost every child needs. So at the top of the page, in order to start to get that concept into the actual language of the statute, Senator Chambers requested and we put in the sentence that "the custody determination of the court shall include both the determination of to whom the legal custody of the child shall be given, and the determination of to whom the physical custody of the child shall be given", and those would be separate and independent decisions. Now, because we put that language in, and because the statutes themselves, in my opinion, need completely rewriting, I'm going to recommend, at least for myself, to Senator Crosby that after we get this over to Select, hopefully, if you see fit, that we have a little hiatus in this discussion and turn this bill over to the Bar Association's family law sector or other experts and let them look at it for a while, to see, not if the philosophy of the bill is the same as theirs, because I think that's the business of the Legislature and of Senator Crosby and those interested, those who are voting