

in the availability of the court system to a grandparent of a child where the parents of the child have never been married, and we are limiting it, as you will see, from page 1351 of the Journal where this amendment is printed, we are limiting it to a situation where there has been an acknowledgement of paternity. Now, frankly, we are doing this in part because of one of the many grandparents who have been down here to visit with us about this bill and she brings a story to us. All right. And she brings us a story that I think needs relief. She brings to us a story that I think a judge in Douglas County or a judge in Lancaster County in the exercise of his or her discretion ought to perhaps grant visitation. And that story is that this woman's son and her son's boy friend (sic) had a child and they got along very well for about five years and the child on a daily basis was left with the grandmother while the parents worked. And the parents lived together, granted they weren't married and that is not an ideal situation but it happens, it happens in today's society. And after three or four years of this grandmother taking care of the child on a daily basis while the parents were working, the parents had a falling out, that falling out spilled over on the relationship between the mother and the father's mother, between the mother of the child and the paternal grandmother of the child, and now the paternal grandmother is denied any contact with the child in spite of the fact that a beneficial relationship was established, in spite of the fact that she virtually was the primary caretaker of that child during working days for several years, and she is saying that it is in the best interests of the child that I be allowed at least the opportunity to go to court and make my case. And all this amendment would allow is it would afford people in that situation simply the opportunity to go to court and make their case, the opportunity to go to court and try and show the court that these four stringent criteria that we have set out in the bill have been met and that is, number one, that there is a beneficial relationship; number two, that it is in the best interests of the child; and, number three, that the visitation will not interfere with the relationship between the parent and the child; and, number four, that there has been a legitimate attempt to reconcile the differences before coming to court. So that is all the amendment does. It is on page 1351 of the Journal so you can take a look at it and I think it makes sense and, again, it is an attempt by Senator Johnson and I to accommodate the concerns of those