

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Avery, would you read the language of your amendment again.

SENATOR AVERY: Okay. Under Section it deletes after paren. (1), deletes "a" and on further in that sentence it deletes "is". It replaces, it reads that any person who also may be the parent, guardian and so or. It broadens the definition of that any person or...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Avery, I'm wondering if you just stated the same thing. In other words I know what you're getting at but we're saying any person who also may be this and then we make that any person modified by these various things so maybe we should say something like any person including a person who may be, or something like that to make it clear that we mean what we're really saying I think. Well, wait a minute, let me change that. What you're saying is any person.

SENATOR AVERY: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So...

SENATOR AVERY: Instead of defining a person as a parent, guardian or person with custody, there's always the case where you have other people that really don't have custody over any children.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So why don't they say any person including and then it lets you know that it means any person, period, and also these people or you could just say any person, probably any adult because, as you point out, your aim is to get beyond the parent, the adult, I meant the parent, the guardian or the one having custody and control. So what you're really saying is any person.

SENATOR AVERY: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And that, to me, would take away the ambiguity that exists with the way it's constructed under your amendment I think. But I think it should say any adult. Or let me ask you a question. Is the goal of this, and probably Senator Ashford would have to be the one but he's working on something else, is the goal of this to make adults responsible when they place these youngsters in the endangering circumstances? Or would we want it to apply to somebody who is