

and I'll...

**SPEAKER WITHEM:** Time. Senator Chambers, your light is on next.

**SENATOR CHAMBERS:** Let me make a couple of observations before I resume asking Senator Bromm to help me on this matter. There are multiple issues involved in what it is that we're talking about. There are different provisions of general law that apply to all of them. An affidavit is an affidavit is an affidavit. Now to state...to make a statement and have it qualify as perjury means that the person knowingly and willfully made a statement knowing it to be false with the intent to deceive. Would you agree with that, Senator Bromm?

**SENATOR BROMM:** I'm sorry...that you have to know that it's false in order to be guilty of perjury? Is that what you said?

**SENATOR CHAMBERS:** Yes, and intend...and you intend to make a knowingly false statement with the intent to deceive.

**SENATOR BROMM:** I think that's generally true.

**SENATOR CHAMBERS:** Now is the failure to completely answer a question perjury?

**SENATOR BROMM:** It could be.

**SENATOR CHAMBERS:** But is it?

**SENATOR BROMM:** It could be.

**SENATOR CHAMBERS:** But it is not necessarily, is it?

**SENATOR BROMM:** Not in all cases.

**SENATOR CHAMBERS:** So we should require due diligence of the mother, not just because we want to get her for perjury but because we're trying to get all of the facts and the information required to effectively implement this law. Would you agree? Let me ask it a different way. In requiring or requesting the affidavit, is the purpose of doing that to see whether the mother will lie, and if she does, you can get her for perjury, or is it to obtain information necessary to arrive at a conclusion which will make possible the implementation of this law?