

April 11, 1995

LB 712

fathers of their right to execute". And I'm just saying that if we want to mirror the language or the thought that is found in line 26, the concept of biological fathers being notified would have to be inserted in your second amendment. In the first one, there is no reference of that kind, but in the second one there is. Would you be opposed to making that change? You can come to my mike if you want to.

SENATOR MATZKE: Senator Chambers, on page 5, we list then who the biological father may be, and I think maybe that will clear up...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR MATZKE: ...part of that...the questions that you have.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But since the language already exists referring to possible biological fathers, the question I'm asking, without intending to be argumentative,...

SENATOR MATZKE: Uh-huh.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...is why do you eliminate that concept of possible biological fathers from your amendment which you make to page 2? And if that was not your intent, would you object to that being reinserted so that your amendment would then read, inform the biological father or possible biological fathers of their right to execute? Because I think the thrust of yours is to make it clear that this documentation doesn't have to be obtained by the agency or...

SPEAKER WITHEM: Time.

SENATOR MATZKE: I would agree to that though. Okay.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Stuhr.

SENATOR STUHR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members, I was speaking in support of Senator Jensen's amendment and I will turn the floor back over to Senator Chambers, if he wishes more time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Oh, thank you, Senator Stuhr. And, Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, Senator Jensen and I have agreed to reinsert those words because the thrust of his