

attorney or agency fails to exercise due diligence in complying with such sections, we're talking about Sections 1 to 9 of the act, or at any time upon the petition or application of any interested party, and it goes on to say the court may appoint a guardian ad litem. The amendment would strike "or at any time upon the petition or application of any interested party". And I believe it raises an issue that needs to be addressed. The argument will be, I think, in opposition to it, if there is opposition, that the authority is there for the court right now to do that. The question that I raise in the amendment is, who should have the ability to raise the issue? And the way the amendment reads it says that at any time upon the petition or application of any interested party, and I guess I want to listen to what Senator Matzke has to say with regard to where this would come into play. I can understand where the attorney, the agency very likely, the court would, any of those parties would, either through petition to the court, or the court of its own volition, appoint a guardian ad litem. But when we talk about application of any interested party I need to know what the practical workings of that will be and who are we intending to allow to have the ability to do that. The issue is one of, does this open the door for, I guess, a disgruntled third party? I mean what is an interested party? Is there a definition of who an interested party is in the bill? I don't believe there is for purposes of this section. But I would like to know how this will impact the adoption process, and here's the reason, and it clearly is one issue that was raised by the adoption agencies. The fear is that there will have to be in every case an application presented for purposes of the appointment of a guardian ad litem, and that that will become the standard. Whether there is a need or not, it will be something that has to be done, it will become a boilerplate for the process in order to insure that all the I's are dotted and T's are crossed. And I would hope that that's not the intent because I see the one thing that...in some cases it will be very necessary. And the ability for that needs to continue. But it, I don't believe, should be as wide open as the language presently would allow for it. And my concern is that for fear of not complying with the statute it will become a standard practice and the costs associated with it will become part of that adoption process. With that, I'd yield any balance of my time to Senator Matzke, again on this amendment, and would ask for its adoption. But I will listen to the response. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Matzke, about five and a half minutes.