

denial of paternity and waiver of rights from a biological father or possible biological fathers. The way you have it your language talks about "the" biological father. So if there are possible...if it's possible that somebody other than the one named is the biological father, none of them would have to be named, no other person would have to be named, in other words, than this one individual. Is that correct?

SENATOR JENSEN: That's my understanding, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And is that your intent?

SENATOR JENSEN: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I would like to ask Senator Matzke a question.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Matzke.

SENATOR MATZKE: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Matzke, is it the intent now to exclude possible fathers from the reach of this bill? I'm not going to argue with you, I just want to know if that's now the intent of the bill.

SENATOR MATZKE: No. No, that's not. I think the effect of this amendment is just to prevent the duplication because what is amending...amended in is the word "biological father" into line 24, so then "biological father" is removed from 26. It's just a...it's just a language duplication that is being avoided. Because if you read...if you read the E & R amendment, the first sentence of Section 5 is changed to read, "in order to attempt to inform biological fathers of their right to execute a relinquishment and consent to adoption or denial of paternity and waiver of rights, and then you eliminate "from a biological father or possible biological fathers". We already said that. So it just eliminates the duplication of language. The agency or attorney representing the biological mother shall notify by registered mail. So it's just a grammatical correction.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, here's what I think would have to be done in Senator Jensen's language if he's not doing away with the requirement to notify biological...the possible fathers. It would be, "inform the biological father or possible biological