

characterize it if Senator Lindsay intended to do so as...the Day amendment as a regression. It's not a regression viewed with respect to the current law. It's a very progressive kind of amendment. It gives access to the courts for these people that are interested in visitation, much better access. Senator Chambers is saying, well, the access may be all right but they shouldn't be dealing with license revocation, let them deal with the other aspects of visitation and use the other enforcement tools. Well, that may be where the Legislature wants to go and that's the next question you will have if you adopt the Day amendment. Then you can decide to what extent you want that amendment to apply in terms of access to the courts. Do you want it to apply to license revocation, just as we would apply it on the child support side? So the other thing that Senator Lindsay said that I think is an exaggeration and that is that we have gone overboard with child support. Folks, as long as what we're doing is fair, as long as the procedures are fair and equitable, how can you say saving the taxpayers money by forcing people to support their own children is going overboard? My God, that strikes me as kind of fundamental. And if it takes these kind of measures to get people to pay the money, I'm for these measures to get them to pay the money. We can't make them good parents, we can't force that to happen, and that's a shame, but we can at least force them, to a large measure, to uphold their societal responsibility to at least pay the money to physically support the child, and license revocation is a part of that. In some respects, I'm surprised that Senator Chambers doesn't like this kind of provision because this strikes at some more well-to-do people who have an easier time hiding their income and hiding their funds.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: It is, really, it makes the whole enforcement process a little more equitable in some respects, and I would think that Senator Chambers would be attracted by that particular aspect of it. In any event, listen to how far you want to go, and I would just ask you one thing. Don't vote for anything that will cause you not to vote for the bill. I think part of what's going on here is that they want to make the visitation provision so onerous that the whole bill then will become too cumbersome and too loaded and we won't get anything done in this area. We need to get some things done. License revocation has been shown to work in other states. We can do that. Vote for as much visitation as you think is