

original form, is not designed to help birth fathers. That's not what the purpose of this bill is. This bill is to try to cut off the rights of the birth father in a much quicker way. That's what it's for. Without this bill, if the birth father is not notified of the birth of the child or is lied to, at whatever point he gets that information, he can come in and challenge the relinquishment of the child for the purposes of adoption. Senator Matzke and Senator Wesely brought this bill not to help that birth father but to help the adoption agencies and others who want to adopt and that is done by cutting off the rights of the birth father in a much shorter period of time. So don't get the idea this bill is aimed to protect the rights of the birth father. That's not the purpose or goal of the bill at all. And I think there is an individual whose rights transcend those of the adoption agencies, of the doctors who broker these...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...adoptions, of the lawyers who broker them, of the adoption agency representatives, and that person is the birth mother. When we're talking about other issues we pretend to be protective of women, young women especially, but our protectiveness applies only when a fetus is involved. But when a child comes into the world then suddenly what she thinks and feels means nothing. What everybody else thinks is more important and their convenience overbalances her interests. My amendment recognizes that the mother legitimately may want to change her mind within two days of this decision and she should have the opportunity. I'm going to put my light on again. It will be my third time. Or I will just wait until I close on this to speak again.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, Madam President, members of the body, it is really interesting in the Unicameral because you never know when you're going to agree with somebody on one amendment and maybe disagree with them on the other amendment. I guess I am rising to say that I support the Chambers amendment. I don't think it's going to get attached. I don't think there's enough support in the body at this time for it. However, I am going to vote for it because I think it's the right thing to do eventually. Whether it takes a public hearing next year or whatever, I think we need to revisit the issue, and I wish to do