

the procedure, it does not really apply to either what the mother or the father has to do. Their responsibilities are equally set forth for both of them in the act. So I would oppose any change in that language, although I agree with Senator Bromm that the phrase "due diligence" applying to the mother probably was not necessary and may raise some ambiguities because the bill specifically sets out what her...what requirements she must meet. So I would urge the adoption of the Bromm amendment.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Matzke. Would like to recognize guests of the Legislature. We have guests of Senator Jones, under the north balcony, Jenni Halstead, Heather Hornung, Jessica Phillips, Amy Conner from Arnold High School. Under the south balcony...oh, that's fine, we can recognize them individually. And we have a guest of Senator Preister's. Under the south balcony a special Deputy Attorney General for the State of Nevada, we have Jim Davenport. Jim. Senator Bromm, yours is the only light on, would you like to be recognized to close?

SENATOR BROMM: Yes.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Bromm, to close.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Nowhere in the bill does it give the standards or criteria for what would be due diligence on the part of the mother. I think if you read the bill and the amendments, you will find that due diligence on the part of the attorney representing the biological mother, due diligence on the part of the agency handling the adoption is fairly well spelled out in the procedural requirements and steps that you have to take. But having the bland statement or the blank statement in there, broad statement that the court has to find that the mother has done due diligence or the court may appoint a guardian ad litem, I think is an unnecessary provision to have. I think it will lead to unnecessary costs in terms of guardian ad litem being appointed where it's unnecessary or there is no need for it. And, rather than have the open language and the question mark about what is due diligence on the part of the mother, I suggest that it would be wise for us, at this point, to take that language out. We leave it in there, again, for the attorney and for the agency and I think we can hold them to those standards. We're dealing sometimes with young people here who are 13 years old, 14 years old, 15 years old, what is due diligence on the part of that person? How