

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

January 27, 2000 LB 120

same city in Nebraska, then one moves to another city. And I saw a case, up in the appellate court, where a guy and his wife were in Lincoln, then he took the child and moved to another city, and the fact that he had moved to that other city, which he did not have the right to do under the original decree, the lower court judge, who has some attitudes, said, well now, since the child has been over there for that amount of time, that's where the child should stay. So, by violating the decree, this man got what he was not entitled to under the decree. He violated the decree by moving the child. Then the fact that he had moved the child was used by another judge to say, well since the child is there, that's where the child should stay. But even in making that ruling, the judge ignored the facts, because the child had not been spending all of his time with that man. So I am not going to agree to language that talks about joint physical custody, but I want somebody to explain to me how that is going to work, when Senator Beutler has already pointed out, as he did when we were talking in my office, how that is not a viable arrangement, unless I misunderstood him yesterday. And I will allow that with the things we were discussing yesterday, I could have misunderstood. I will allow that perhaps I misunderstood what he said this morning. But I thought he was saying that we're not talking about joint physical custody; I thought that's what I heard. But, as I read the amendment, that's precisely what is being attempted to be put in the law, and that is definitely not anything I agree to. So what I'm going to do is say, like that movie, (singing). That's from "The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly", and my rendering was "the Ugly", but these things are so intermixed, the good, the bad, and the ugly, that I'm repudiating everything in this amendment. It has become intermixed with other things and it's blended. And I'm not going to put you all through it, and certainly not myself, with all the time I feel I've wasted now in saying if you take the first three lines, on page 2, up to such and such a word, you skip those six words, and then pick it up after that, and take seven words, that's what I agreed to. But then when you go beyond that I disagree. Now I don't know if Senator Landis is going to speak on this on this at all, but I believe that he felt I was working with him in good faith, and I know he was working in good faith. And I'm not applying this next comment to Senator Landis, but there are people who think that I never operate in good faith. And that may be their opinion, and