

Isn't that part of what is going on here? Isn't that what the proponents really argue, that this grandparent has a close beneficial, loving, caring relationship with the grandchild and on that basis deserves to have custody of the child at some times, visitation? Given that relationship then, why is it a burden beyond the basis of countenancing that should the child be deprived of necessities, this person can stand for the well being of the child, can guarantee the well being of the child? Why can't the law, as it hands out the benefit, also hand out the burden? It does with respect to everyone else. It does with respect, as I understand it, Wisconsin, on exactly this basis. The nation has been swept with the tide of handing out the pleasure of grandparenthood to people and now there accompanies that nagging question of what is the other shoe? Wisconsin has answered that by saying grandparents can be responsible for grandchildren. I suggest that we take up that question now and adopt this amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: I have eight names. Senator Labeledz, on the motion. Okay, Senator DeCamp, on the Landis motion.

SENATOR DECAMP: On the motion, I am not necessarily questioning the germaneness because it certainly deals with the subject. What I am saying, it is a very, very major substantive change in the whole direction and purpose of the legislation and I am suggesting that possibly before you decide to go into establishing child support, that issue, child support for grandparents, that issue in and of itself should receive some examination, should receive some public hearing maybe. And I am not necessarily in disagreement with the amendment because it is optional. What I am suggesting though is that the amendment is such a major thing that it would probably be inappropriate to put it on this bill. I would submit further that the bill itself, the issue of grandparents' visitation rights, that is an issue that has received multitudes of public hearings and it is an issue upon which apparently probably a majority has focused and decided on a direction they want to go on it and indeed if it would get into law, then it would be appropriate next year for Senator Landis or anybody else to develop it or expand it or take the next step should they choose and that next step might well be determination of the propriety or beneficialness of actually having some obligations financially. But I don't think at this time on this bill that is appropriate.