

But it could be such a thing that even if those two things happened that there had been perhaps hard feelings between the grandparent and their own child, the child's parents...the grandchild's parents in the past, and there really wasn't the relationship for whatever reason. Now all of a sudden there is going to be a petition to the courts to interject themselves in this adversarial situation. I have a lot of problems with that whole concept, number one, but, number two, I think we had ought to at least require a showing that there not only could be a significant relationship, but that there has been some sort of a relationship in the past, not one or the other but instead both. That is what the amendment would do.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Thank you. Senator Hoagland, please.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Well, I would stand, colleagues, to oppose Senator Vickers' amendment. Now the purpose of having the bill read that a past relationship or a present relationship is enough to justify visitation I think is evident. Grandparents wouldn't have to go to court if there were not a dispute, if there were not the inability to work out an agreement with the parents and the grandparents. Now Senator Lowell Johnson pointed out a defect in the committee amendments when we met 10 days ago, and Senator Johnson said if you require a present relationship how about a situation where the parents have not allowed the grandparents to see the child for five years, yet prior to that five year period there was a significant relationship. So the amendment that we adopted, two days ago, requires the grandparents to show either a present significant relationship or a past significant relationship, and we need to leave the language that way. Now Senator Vickers would change it to require both a present significant relationship and a past significant relationship. And I think you can understand how that is going to undermine the bill if we do that because it may be a rare case indeed, particularly where there is a dispute, that there will continue to be a significant relationship between the grandparent and the grandchild. How can they show there is a present significant relationship if the parent has not allowed them to see the child for the last five years, or the last three years? So I would ask you to reject this amendment. If you want to vote against the bill, fine. But don't come in and try to undercut the bill by imposing a requirement that is going to be difficult to meet and is going to make the bill