

could determine by the initial plan agreed to by both parents ahead of time when it is submitted to the court, who is going to have primary residence, who is going to be making decisions on what school they go to, what camp they go to, what religion they are. That can all be determined prior to even the hearing and be agreed to by both parents. The idea, if you have two people making decisions, that isn't changing under current law or future law. That still happens. Just because you have sole custody or you are noncustodial, if you don't want that child being brought up in a particular religion, there is nothing stopping you taking him back to court right now. Joint custody is an issue that has some pros and cons. It has some caveats. I'm not suggesting it shouldn't be used in rare cases, but I am saying effectively it is not going to be used at all. I am saying that it should be a viable situation. It should be allowed by the courts. It should be used in the rare occasions and it should be for the sole benefit and the best interests of the child. That's all we're trying to do. Issue one, should the Supreme Court opinion effectively change statutes...

SPEAKER NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: ...or shouldn't they? I believe that they should not. If we decide as a body that joint custody is a bad idea, let's forbid it. Let's forbid it, but let's do it here. Let's not have a court opinion that wasn't even called for make that change for us. That's issue one. Issue two, is joint custody a good idea or a bad idea even in the cases where we're going to allow it under this new statute or this change or remake statute? That's a different issue. That is a legitimate issue. There are pros and cons. I happen to believe, after being involved in this for quite some time now intensively, that it provides an alternative that is better than just sole custody and if you want to hear, I can give you a handout. There are several things we can talk about as to what is better about it, what the caveats are. I believe it's a good idea to put this in law and take it out of the hands of an opinion.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Chronister.

SENATOR CHRONISTER: (No response.)

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Smith.