

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 3, 2003

LB 54

SENATOR CUDABACK: Well,...

SENATOR RAIKES: Yeah.

SENATOR CUDABACK: ...if you're...

SENATOR RAIKES: Yes. Yes, I will.

SENATOR CUDABACK: ...speaking, anybody else can push their light also.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay.

SENATOR CUDABACK: So I need to probably know one way or the other.

SENATOR RAIKES: All right. Thank you. Members of the Legislature, first, to agree with what Senator Erdman pointed out, which I think he's exactly right, we are doing the same thing. We are more or less putting in statute what current practice is. My point is, it's a good time to have a discussion about whether or not this is the appropriate practice. He mentioned several times, or at least once, and I think effectively, that this is intended to be in the best interests of the child. It's hard for me to understand, if there's a training requirement, why the best interests of the child wouldn't be served by requiring foster care providers who are relatives to also take the training rather than exempting it. So in that connection, if I could ask Senator Jensen a question. Senator, do you know of evidence that would suggest that foster care providing to relatives can be accomplished even though there's not training, as compared to providing foster care for nonrelatives?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Jensen, would you respond?

SENATOR JENSEN: I don't have any evidence, I guess, that would support that, no.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay. So you would conclude from that that