

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

May 19, 2005

LB 117

not around meth, and returned to their parents following treatment, if the parents want to go that route and make the decision to be parents again. But I think this is a reasonable amendment and I guess I don't have anything more, other than to answer anybody's questions on it. Again, it just strikes the words "in or." Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Flood. You've heard the opening on FA284 to the Bourne amendment, FA281. Open for discussion. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, I would support the amendment. And I would like to ask Senator Synowiecki a question or two, if he will respond.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Synowiecki, would you?

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: Yes, of course.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Synowiecki, during your work, if you went to one of these homes that has been discussed and crack cocaine was found to be in a location where children could gain access to it, could that fact be used as a basis to further show that the child had been endangered?

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: You know, Senator Chambers, I would just have to work off of a hypothetical because that never really happened.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: But I could see where perhaps, although I think there's a heightened level of intrinsic danger with methamphetamine cooking than just simply having the drug your speaking of available in the residence. So I guess what I'm saying is I don't know.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. Thank you. But I have seen articles where children were removed from the home because meth...not meth, but cocaine, heroin, crack were accessible by these children. The current language in the statute is adequate to