

as well. So your last comment about striking all parts of visitation I'm not quite sure I understand where you're going on that. I do understand where you're going on the license revocation. I guess Senator Day, well both of them are in conversation so I think I'm just going to waive off at this point and wait for Senator Chambers to have more time to answer.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Vrtiska, to speak to the Chambers amendment. Senator Vrtiska, to speak to the Chambers amendment. Senator Day, to speak to the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR DAY: Thank you, Madam President and colleagues. I would rise in support of the amendment as Senator Chambers has it now. If the body feels that the license revocation on visitation interference would like to come out, I have no problem with that. I stayed neutral when he brought this up before, really to see what the feeling of the body was. I have heard from noncustodials and that does not seem to be a major factor for them. I would oppose, if Senator Chambers tries to take all reference to visitation interference out of this bill because I think even what would be left in would be very good. We still are giving noncustodials an opportunity to get into the courts easier with visitation interference through the referee and I think that would be an important advantage that they would receive. So as he does it now with striking...that we would have license suspension on visitation interference, I have no problem with that. I do hope we keep something on visitation interference in there. I think it's an important problem that we need to address and I think this is a start at addressing that. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Day. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President and members of the Legislature, and especially to the Clerk for all the help he gave me, I'm going to stay with the amendment that I have which would merely strike the provisions about revoking the licenses and I appreciate what Senator Day said in support of the amendment. The reason I was having a problem is because Senator Day's committee amendment which was adopted says strike the original sections which means the green copy is gone. The committee amendment is 1026 and the amendments to the committee amendments which are written on white paper are also a part of the bill. So I was under the misperception that the committee