

of people involved in the process. Let's keep our focus on the issues. We have done that so far. You have made decisions. I think they have been good decisions, although I didn't agree with one of them. They are reasonable decisions. There is no point to backing away from this simply because it is a little bit controversial. All the hang up now is on visitation. Almost no discussion is on child support, and yet Senator Day's original bill was on child support, not on visitation. For 20 years, we agreed and dealt separately with the question of visitation, and now, all of a sudden, the two are inextricably linked in certain minds, and not only are they inextricably linked, but, all of a sudden, we have to correct 20 years of not paying attention to visitation and correct it all at once on this bill. Senator Day has not ignored visitation. She said, yes, let's do something about that too, just not quite as quickly as others would have it. And so I hope you will not let an issue go this way simply because you don't want to focus on it, or somebody doesn't want to focus on it. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Day, on the bracket motion.

SENATOR DAY: Thank you, Senator Crosby and colleagues. I rise in opposition to this, and I think we have to go back and look at how this all started. My original bill was to deal with child support enforcement. As discussion was in the committee, there was talk about tying visitation in with this, and I was approached, would you be against having that tied into it? No, I know we have a problem with visitation interference, if we can tie it in and work something out where this is dealt with in this bill, this is fine with me. I don't know, the major change that was happening was with the committee amendment that came out, putting something under the same agency as the child support agency, which is not done, to the best of our knowledge, in any other state. My concern was that to have it handled fairly that we needed to put it administratively in the courts. I never felt that I was going against an agreement because the agreement to me was that we would handle it administratively. And it is my belief that that's what we are doing, we are just not putting it under the Department of Social Services. We need to get back to the original reason of this bill, and that's for enforcement of child support. We've had lengthy debates here on the floor as we go to welfare, and we talk about welfare reform. This is a very important part to it. It may not help those women that are already on welfare, but it can help prevent women