SENATE COMMITTEE ON CRIME & CORRECTIONS

March 26, 1997 Hearing Room B

1:00 P.M. Tapes 47 - 49

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Sen. Shirley Stull, Chair

Sen. Jeannette Hamby, Vice-Chair

Sen. Avel Gordly

Sen. Eileen Qutub

Sen. Veral Tarno

Sen. Cliff Trow

STAFF PRESENT:

Nikola Jones, Counsel

Julie Clemente, Administrative Support

MEASURE/ISSUES HEARD: Public Hearing: SB 689, SB 573

Work Session: SB 423, SB 483

These minutes are in compliance with Senate and House Rules. <u>Only text enclosed in quotation</u> marks reports a speaker's exact words. For complete contents, please refer to the tapes.

| - | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Tape/# | Speaker | Comments |
|---|----------------|--|
| Tape 47, A |] | |
| 003 | Chair Stull | Opens meeting at 1:10 p.m. |
| | | |
| OPENS WORK SESSION ON SB 423 | | |
| 010 | Nikola Jones | Committee Counsel. Reviews SB 423 for the Committee. Creates crime of obstructing a peace officer or other public servant. Refers to SB 423-2 amendments. [Exhibit A] |
| | Rep. Prozanski | Comments on SB 423-2 amendments. |
| 028 | Sen. Trow | Do these amendments take care of the problems with the bill? |
| | Rep. Prozanski | Yes. Explains. |
| | | |
| 048 | Sen. Hamby | MOTION: Moves to ADOPT SB 423-2 amendments dated 03/14/97. |
| | Chair Stull | AYE: 5 - Hamby, Qutub, Tarno, Trow, Stull NAY: 1 - Gordly The motion CARRIES. |
| 055 | Sen. Hamby | MOTION: Moves SB 423 to the floor with a DO PASS AS |
| 033 | Sell. Halliby | AMENDED recommendation. |
| | | VOTE: 5-1 |
| | | AYE: 5 - Hamby, Qutub, Tarno, Trow, Stull |
| | | NAY: 1 - Gordly |
| | | The motion CARRIES. |
| | Chair Stull | |
| | | CHAIR STULL will lead discussion on the floor. |
| CLOSES WORK SESSION ON SB 423 OPENS | | |
| OPENS | | |

| Nikola Jones | Committee Counsel. No amendments were suggested. |
|----------------------|---|
| Sen. Tarno | Reviews the bill for the Committee. Requires local subdivision to pay proceeds from the sale of weapon seized by or donated to a police agency to the account of the police agency that seized or received the weapon. |
| Chair Stull | Point of clarification - proceeds intended for the purposes of crime safety and education. |
| Sen. Trow | Likes bill. Comments that he doesn't want to see an incentive for selling weapons rather than destroying. Explains. |
| Sen. Tarno | MOTION: Moves SB 483 to the floor with a DO PASS recommendation. |
| | VOTE: 6-0 |
| | AYE: In a roll call vote, all members present vote Aye. |
| | The motion CARRIES. |
| Chair Stull | |
| Chair Stull | |
| | SEN. TARNO will lead discussion on the floor. |
| | |
| | |
| Robert Miller | Doesn't need to testify, things have been worked out. |
| | Special Assistant to Director, State Office for Services to Children and Families. |
| | Program Manager, Child Protective and Family Based Services, State Office for Services to Children and Families . Submits written testimony in support of SB 689. [Exhibit B] |
| Gallagher | Area of technical questions. Continues. |
| Timothy Travis | Juvenile Rights Project. Submits SB 689 -1 amendments [Exhibit C] This bill creates as large a change in system for our abused and neglected children as Senate Bill 1 created for our delinquent children. |
| Chair Stull | Not able to provide an engrossed version this time. |
| | Connie Gallagher Victor Congleton Gallagher Timothy |

| Fravis Sen. Tarno Fravis Fravis Nikola Jones Fravis Chair Stull Fravis Nancy Miller Fravis Chair Stull Fravis Chair Stull | Continues: Reflects removal of language.Questions for clarification regarding the removal of language.Correct.Continues: Additional change in sub (c) should read "in the case of a child under "10" years of age - not under "2" years of age. Explains.Committee Counsel. Comments for clarification.Moved the "included but not limited to" up. Explains.Asks for clarification.Replies. Page 7, line 23. Continues.Citizen Review Board and the State Court Administrator's Office. Actually going to delete all of Section 11.Continues: Page 7, line 33.>Allegations against the parent. Continues.Questions for clarification. Placement with biological relative, records checked?It is. Explains |
|--|--|
| Travis Travis Nikola Jones Travis Chair Stull Travis Nancy Miller Travis Chair Stull Travis Travis Travis Travis Travis Travis | Correct. Continues: Additional change in sub (c) should read "in the case of a child under "10" years of age - not under "2" years of age. Explains. Committee Counsel. Comments for clarification. Moved the "included but not limited to" up. Explains. Asks for clarification. Replies. Page 7, line 23. Continues. Citizen Review Board and the State Court Administrator's Office. Actually going to delete all of Section 11. Continues: Page 7, line 33. >Allegations against the parent. Continues. Questions for clarification. Placement with biological relative, records checked? |
| Fravis Nikola Jones Fravis Chair Stull Fravis Nancy Miller Fravis Chair Stull Fravis | Continues: Additional change in sub (c) should read "in the case of a child under "10" years of age - not under "2" years of age. Explains. Committee Counsel. Comments for clarification. Moved the "included but not limited to" up. Explains. Asks for clarification. Replies. Page 7, line 23. Continues. Citizen Review Board and the State Court Administrator's Office. Actually going to delete all of Section 11. Continues: Page 7, line 33. >Allegations against the parent. Continues. Questions for clarification. Placement with biological relative, records checked? |
| Nikola Jones Fravis Chair Stull Fravis Nancy Miller Fravis Chair Stull Fravis | child under "10" years of age - not under "2" years of age. Explains. Committee Counsel. Comments for clarification. Moved the "included but not limited to" up. Explains. Asks for clarification. Replies. Page 7, line 23. Continues. Citizen Review Board and the State Court Administrator's Office. Actually going to delete all of Section 11. Continues: Page 7, line 33. >Allegations against the parent. Continues. Questions for clarification. Placement with biological relative, records checked? |
| Travis Chair Stull Travis Nancy Miller Fravis Chair Stull Fravis | Moved the "included but not limited to" up. Explains. Asks for clarification. Replies. Page 7, line 23. Continues. Citizen Review Board and the State Court Administrator's Office. Actually going to delete all of Section 11. Continues: Page 7, line 33. >Allegations against the parent. Continues. Questions for clarification. Placement with biological relative, records checked? |
| Chair Stull Fravis Nancy Miller Fravis Chair Stull Fravis | Asks for clarification. Replies. Page 7, line 23. Continues. Citizen Review Board and the State Court Administrator's Office. Actually going to delete all of Section 11. Continues: Page 7, line 33. >Allegations against the parent. Continues. Questions for clarification. Placement with biological relative, records checked? |
| Γravis Nancy Miller Γravis Chair Stull Γravis | Replies. Page 7, line 23. Continues. Citizen Review Board and the State Court Administrator's Office. Actually going to delete all of Section 11. Continues: Page 7, line 33. >Allegations against the parent. Continues. Questions for clarification. Placement with biological relative, records checked? |
| Nancy Miller Fravis Chair Stull Fravis | Citizen Review Board and the State Court Administrator's Office. Actually going to delete all of Section 11. Continues: Page 7, line 33. >Allegations against the parent. Continues. Questions for clarification. Placement with biological relative, records checked? |
| Travis Chair Stull Travis | Office. Actually going to delete all of Section 11. Continues: Page 7, line 33. >Allegations against the parent. Continues. Questions for clarification. Placement with biological relative, records checked? |
| Chair Stull Fravis | >Allegations against the parent. Continues. Questions for clarification. Placement with biological relative, records checked? |
| Chair Stull Fravis | Questions for clarification. Placement with biological relative, records checked? |
| Fravis | Questions for clarification. Placement with biological relative, records checked? |
| Fravis | records checked? |
| | It is. Explains |
| | |
| | |
| Fravis | Continues: Page 9, line 5. |
| Miller | Line 16 of the same page. Continues. |
| | Page 4 of the amendments, line 21. |
| | |
| | >places a time certain |
| | >suggests change on line 24 - after the word "petition" insert a period [.] and delete "or dismiss the petition"- Continues. |
| lones | Point of clarification regarding Section 11. |
| Miller | That is correct. Continues. |
| Sen. Tarno | Confused regarding Section 11. |
| Miller | Eleven comes out. Continues. |
| lones | Clarifies for the Committee. |
| Miller | Continues. Line 22 of the amendments, page 5 adding language after "efforts" |
| Fom Hart | Oregon District Attorney's Association. Speaks to SB 689-1 amendments. [Exhibit C] Addresses a concern expressed by Sen. Tarno - line 8, page 1. >putting bracketed language back in except in line 3 "that this is not always" is changed to "it is not always". |
| | filler ones filler |

| 219 | Hart | >Wanted to expand the definition of what constitutes "serious physical injury to children." - Explains. |
|--|---------------------|---|
| 249 | Vice-Chair Hamby | States for the record - positive nod from prior witnesses regarding statements from Hart. |
| | Hart | Continues. |
| 292 | Sen. Tarno | States concern: Intentional infliction by a parent causing a broken arm or leg, create a permanent effect on that child? |
| | Hart | No. A broken leg is not permanent under the law. Continues. |
| 370 | Sen. Qutub | Does the word "or" make the difference between permanent and protracted? |
| | Hart | "Or" is disjunctive. Continues. |
| 400 | Vice-Chair Hamby | For the record, supporters nodding support. |
| TAPE 47, B | 1 | |
| 011 | Hart | Continues: Gives example of a situation where a child has appointed their own counsel. |
| | | >don't want to compromise any child's attorney |
| | Jones | The language was added during discussions in work group. Delete the sentence? |
| | Hart | Yes. Continues. |
| 039 | Travis | Agrees that Mr. Hart has a point. Continues. |
| | Vice-Chair Hamby | Agreement that everything after the period on line 11 and entire line 12 should be deleted. |
| 049 | Hart | Continues: Discusses concern on page 4 of the amendments, line 29. >make both parties exchange discoverable materials |
| 078 | Travis | States there is a provision in the juvenile code which covers discovery. Continues. Feels discovery piece is redundant. |
| | Hart | Replies. If we want to make the timing work, we ought to put the 60- day obligation on both parties. |
| 099 | Vice-Chair Hamby | For record, affirmative nod from proponents and from the department. |
| <u>CLOSES</u> <u>PUBLIC</u> <u>HEARING ON</u> <u>SB 689</u> <u>OPENS</u> <u>PUBLIC</u> <u>HEARING ON</u> SB 573 | | |

| 114 | Sen. Eileen Qutub | Representing Senate District 4 . Testifies in support of SB 573. This bill creates presumption that joint custody of a child is in the best interests and welfare of the child. Gives background regarding how this bill came to be and her interest in the subject. Discusses studies on the subject and dramatic increase in social trends regarding the absence of fathers. Bill addresses both mothers and fathers. |
|------------|--------------------------|--|
| 209 | Sen. Qutub | Continues: Most beneficial thing about SB 573 is the stability and emotional support it will provide the children. Introduces testimony by N. Gregory Hamilton, M.D. [Exhibit D], Linda McClelland [Exhibit F] and Jeff Fossum [Exhibit E] all in support of SB 573. >are willing to make necessary compromises in the legislation |
| 225 | Sen. Gordly | Are you aware of other states who have moved in this direction? |
| 223 | Sen. Qutub | Fifteen states. California - Texas being the most recent. |
| 239 | Kevin C. Schaumleffle | Presents written testimony in support of SB 573. [Exhibit G] Addresses some of the important merits regarding joint custody. |
| 302 | Schaumleffle | Continues testimony. |
| 384 | Russell Lipetzky | Chair, Family & Juvenile Law Section, Oregon State Bar. Submits written testimony in opposition of SB 573. [Exhibit H] States organization was not consulted regarding SB 573 and that they oppose the bill on both policy and technical grounds. Discusses substantial technical flaws along with terms and phrases which are central to an application of the statute, but which are undefined. |
| TAPE 48, B | | |
| 036 | Lipetzky | Continues testimony. Surprised to learn that the Family Law Task Force approves of joint custody. |
| 045 | Sen. Qutub | Comments for clarification of Lipetzky's statement. >input from the public was overwhelming for joint custody |
| | Lipetzky | Understands that the task force does not approve court mandated joint custody. Continues. |
| 084 | Sen. Gordly | Questions for clarification. Did that study focus on states that have legislation on the books? |
| | Lipetzky | Sample poll was in California. Continues. |
| | Sen. Gordly | Continues for clarification. |
| | Lipetzky | No. |
| 097 | Sen. Hamby | Calls attention to study in testimony, page 272. [Exhibit H] |
| | Lipetzky | This is a 1989 study. Continues. |
| 112 | Sen. Gordly | Continues for clarification. Sounds like we are focused on what happens in court orders where there is a "bitterly" contested divorce. |
| | Lipetzky | Problem is that there is an amazing lack of research in this area. Continues. |

| <u>HEARING O</u> <u>SB 573</u> | 11 | |
|---|-------------|--|
| <u>CLOSES</u> <u>PUBLIC</u> HEADINC O | N | |
| 104 GL QGEG | Sen. Gordly | Questions why was this bill placed with this Committee. |
| 093 | Chair Stull | Comments for the record. Have found Mr. Lipetzky to have an open mind and extremely sensitive to fathers who are having difficulty in finding equity in the system. Continues. |
| | Lipetzky | Replies. Have been a very vocal proponent in saying to committees to help with visitation rights. Continues. |
| 073 | Sen. Tarno | Comments on the lives of men who are put in this position and want to parent. Asks Lipetzky to put himself in their place. |
| | | >parents who want to jointly parent, will >those who are adversarial, will continue to be so |
| | Lipetzky | Replies. Not read the study. Comments on his 10 years of experience in domestic relations. |
| TAPE 49, A 041 | Sen. Qutub | Comments on study by Dr. Williams that talks about forcing cooperation - later becomes actual cooperation. |
| | | to parent jointly. Continues. |
| 388 | Lipetzky | Our conclusion is that children benefit from parents who are willing |
| 313 | Lipetzky | Continues testimony. |
| | Sen. Qutub | I wouldn't call every other weekend significant time. |
| | Lipetzky | Court should have as much discretion as possible. |
| | Sen. Qutub | amount of time. Differs from parent to parent. Continues Continues for clarification. |
| | Lipetzky | is a significant amount of time?Replies. Who would be the person to determine what is significant |
| 289 | Sen. Qutub | Questions for clarification. Would you say that every other weekend |
| | Lipetzky | It identifies it as a deficiency. Continues. |
| 207 | Sen. Qutub | Was not the intent. Continues. |
| 156 | Lipetzky | Continues referencing written testimony taking bill section by section. |
| | Lipetzky | Replies. |
| 144 | Sen. Gordly | Questions for clarification the point Lipetzky is contesting. Are you arguing this language should not be removed? |
| 124 | Lipetzky | Continues testimony. Discusses technical things about the bill which cause concern. |

| | Chair Stull | Declares meeting adjourned at 3:07 p.m. |
|--|-------------|---|
| | | |

Submitted by, Reviewed by,

Julie Clemente, Nikola Jones,

Administrative Support Counsel

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

- A Proposed SB 423-2 Amendments Staff 1 pg
- B Testimony in Support of SB 689 Victor Congleton 2 pgs
- C Proposed SB 689-1 Amendments Staff 6 pgs
- D Testimony in Support of SB 573 by N. Gregory Hamilton, M.D. Sen. Qutub 3 pgs
- E Testimony in Support of SB 573 by Jeff Fossum Sen. Qutub 2 pgs
- F Testimony in Support of SB 573 by Linda McClelland Sen. Qutub 2 pgs
- G Testimony in Support of SB 573 Kevin C. Schaumleffle 5 pgs
- H Testimony in Opposition of SB 573 Russell Lipetzky 8 pgs