

just rendering that decision. They came up with additional language and I'd like to read that language to you and I'd like you to listen to the language. It's very short, about four sentences. It says, this is the Supreme Court decision...opinion, says, "It occurs to us that in a given case joint custody might very well act to preserve the parent-child bond for both parties and, thus avoid severance of either of the attachments." Fine, it says that joint custody can be the best issue. But they go on and they say, probably not very often. They say, "We believe, however, that such arrangement must be reserved for the most rare of cases." And then it says, "That is where in the judgment of the trial court the parents are of such maturity that that arrangement will not operate to allow the child to manipulate the parents or confuse the child's sense of direction." They're saying it has got to be in the best interest of the child and they see it kind of being a rare situation where it will be handled that way. But here is the kicker. It says, "A collateral question exists as to why those most ideal of parents who would satisfactorily cope with the conflicts inherent in joint custody arrangement came to be divorced in the first place, or in the first instance." Now what they are saying is you can have two adults, husband and wife, that have decided that their marriage is in need of separation. They cannot continue as husband and wife. It doesn't say that they aren't mature people. It doesn't say that they don't have mutual respect and admiration for each other. It doesn't say they don't hold each other in the highest regard of congeniality. It says that they just aren't able to get along as husband and wife anymore. And what the Supreme Court said, if you're mature enough to handle joint custody, you must be mature enough to be able to get along as husband and wife. What they're saying is, you wouldn't get a divorce if you were mature people, basically, and if you are going to get a divorce, you aren't mature enough people to have joint custody except in the very rarest of occasions. Now, what did this do in effect? It did not change statute. The statute is not changed. What it did in effect is it said to district court judges that you're going to look at these in rare cases. District court judges, we've talked to them. They say, you're right, we do anyway, we don't have any problem with this. This is the way we go. But it said to the attorneys that represent the parents and the children in cases, it said to the attorneys, don't even bring us joint custody possibilities. Don't even bring the idea of