

embarrassing, Senator Chambers, to have to put language in the statute that ought to be apparent to everyone, but I have been...I feel like a farmer out in Butler County who has got a bunch of pigs in a very...in a pen with a very poor fence around it and every day he goes out and he puts another board on the fence.

SPEAKER NICHOL: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: And I have been doing that for fifteen, seventeen years, trying to put another board on the fence. I have about run out of time, about run out of patience, about run out of boards, but I thought I would try one more board on the fence since apparently it has to be done and it might give some other members of the judiciary a little more reassurance some time in the future at least to remove that doubt. Thank you very much, Senator, for letting me have so much of your time.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Hannibal.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Mr. Speaker and members, I want to take the opportunity and not belabor it, but take the opportunity and talk just a little bit more about the joint custody part, as you well know that this bill has two parts. And I want to state to you that Senator Chambers is absolutely right, the original catalyst that brought me into this issue was not a constituent, an acquaintance, that brought forward this problem. And he is right that that person, because he won a joint custody and they were not in agreement, will not benefit under this bill, nor will many people benefit under this bill that want joint custody when both people don't agree. Upon looking into the Supreme Court decision and the situation, my interest did not diminish at all. As a matter of fact, it heightened to continue on this way, because I think what the Supreme Court was trying to say, they were trying to say that joint custody is a viable option and it should be on rare occasions and those rare occasions should be when it is in the best interests of the child and when both parents can be mature enough and agree on a situation and do it for the right reason so that it is in the best interests of the child, because after all that is the most important party here. And I think the Supreme Court was trying to say that, but the way their wording came out, it did not come out that way. And I don't believe that I am changing what the actual thought of those justices, although