

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

March 3, 2003

LB 54

this is based on...this idea, in current practice, by the way, is based on sort of anecdotal or other evidence that was, well, this just seems like a...seems like a reasonable thing to do, rather than any sort of hard evidence.

SENATOR JENSEN: It would seem reasonable to me. Now, my idea of a family might be different than someone else's, and I also must say that there are probably some relatives that you would not want to place a foster child in, period.

SENATOR RAIKES: And hopefully the procedures in place would sort those out.

SENATOR JENSEN: And I think they are.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay. Well, let me ask you then one other thing. It's been mentioned that, you know, it's difficult to come up with foster care providers, particularly good ones. Why, in your opinion, wouldn't it be a good idea to just take out relatives and sort of allow this route to licensure for either relatives or nonrelative providers? It seems in some sense you're suggesting that as far as training is concerned the best nonrelative provider is not going to be effective...as effective as the worst relative provider.

SENATOR JENSEN: No, I wouldn't suggest that. I certainly would suggest, however, one of the things that you try to do is to, boy, you take a kid out of their environment, out of their family, sometimes that's very difficult, and sometimes it stays with them for their entire life span. But if you...if there is a relative that is available, I think it's...it would be good to encourage them to be part of this process, provided, again, that they...and the department I think will do this and it's on a case-by-case basis. If they're a relative that is available that can provide that care, I think that is a good situation for both the child...

SENATOR RAIKES: Although you understand that certainly the relative could be a provider with no question if they just agreed to do the training.