

prepared to answer them.

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

SENATOR DIERKS: Thank you, Madam President. I wonder if I could have a little dialogue with Senator Chambers, please.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR DIERKS: You said that the purpose of your amendment was to strike all reference to license revocation and then you qualified that by saying in reference to visitation rights.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SENATOR DIERKS: You don't strike it though in reference to child support.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, because, and can I tell you why?

SENATOR DIERKS: Sure.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: The visitation part was added as an amendment to 592. In the original 592 they had the provisions for striking, I meant for revoking licenses. I have not talked about the original aspects of 592 at all yet, but I intend to. But in my presentation I want to keep the two distinct. And since this was added to visitation as an amendment, I want to strike the reference there and then I'm also opposed to it with reference to the child support side but they're two different matters and I would take them one at the time.

SENATOR DIERKS: I guess that philosophically then you're saying that if we're going to tie visitation rights to license revocation, you prefer not to do that so that in other words, well, I guess I'm trying to figure out why license revocation would even take place concerning visitation rights.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, I'm saying it shouldn't. I see no reason why it should. That's why I want to strike it. Then the problems that really exist in trying to enforce visitation rights can be discussed.