

**SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE**  
**Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair**  
**2023-2024 Regular Session**

AB 2929 (Juan Carrillo)  
Version: June 19, 2024  
Hearing Date: June 25, 2024  
Fiscal: Yes  
Urgency: No  
AWM

**SUBJECT**

Dependents: family finding

**DIGEST**

This bill requires a social worker's supplemental report filed in connection with a status review hearing to include, for a nonminor dependent who does not reside with relatives, kin, or an Indian custodian, the social worker's continued efforts to locate relatives or kin who could provide family support or a placement; and requires the juvenile court to determine, at the status review hearing, whether the social worker has continued to make those efforts.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Research shows that a child taken from the custody of their parent, guardian, or Indian custodian will suffer fewer negative outcomes if they are placed with a trusted relative or other person with whom they have a family-like relationship rather than a stranger. To this end, when a child is taken to custody and declared a dependent of the juvenile court, State policy requires the social worker to take specific efforts to locate a relative, as defined, who may serve as a caregiver for the child. Last year, the Legislature passed AB 448 (Juan Carrillo, 2023), which would have required social workers and probation officers of dependent children to undertake specified family finding efforts, and for juvenile courts to make specified findings relating to the adequacy of those efforts. Governor Newsom vetoed AB 448, citing cost concerns.

This bill imposes a more modest requirement relating to a social worker's efforts to locate a relative placement and the court's review of those efforts at a status review hearing. Specifically, this bill requires a social worker, in their supplemental report regarding a child or nonminor dependent who is already not living with a relative, as defined, to address their ongoing efforts to locate suitable family members (or, in the case of an Indian child, ongoing active efforts); and for the court, at the status review hearing, to determine whether the social worker has continued those efforts or active

efforts. These requirements are intended to ensure that a juvenile court is provided with the necessary information to determine whether a social worker is conducting an adequately diligent effort to locate a beneficial relative placement for the child. The author has agreed to amend the bill to replace references to a child's "kin" with terms that are defined in the Welfare and Institutions Code.

This bill is sponsored by the Children's Law Center of California and is supported by A New Way of Life Reentry Project, the Alliance for Children's Rights, the California Alliance of Caregivers, California CASA, the California Tribal Families Coalition, the County Welfare Directors Association, Dependency Advocacy Center, Families Inspiring Reentry & Reunification 4 Everyone, John Burton Advocates for Youth, the Judicial Council of California, Los Angeles Dependency Lawyers, Inc., Public Counsel, Stanislaus Family Counselors, Starting Over, Inc., and the Youth Law Center. The Committee has not received timely opposition to this bill. The Senate Human Services Committee passed this bill with a vote of 4-0.

### **PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW**

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (ICWA), which requires states to establish specific adoption preferences for a child who is a member of a federally recognized Indian tribe, or who is eligible to be a member and is the child of a member of a federally recognized Indian tribe, and to make specified efforts to notify the child's tribe when an Indian child is placed in foster care. (25 U.S.C. §§ 1901 et seq.)
- 2) Establishes specific state statutes to implement ICWA's protections for Indian children in the juvenile court system, which include:
  - a) Defining "active efforts" as affirmative, active, thorough and timely efforts intended primarily to maintain or reunite an Indian child with their family; to the maximum extent possible, active efforts shall be provided in a manner consistent with the prevailing social and cultural conditions and way of life of the Indian child's tribe and shall be conducted in partnership with the Indian child and the Indian child's parents, extended family members, Indian custodians, and tribe.
  - b) Imposing an affirmative duty on the court, county welfare department, and probation department to inquire whether a child, for whom a petition to make the child a dependent or ward of the juvenile court has been, or may be, filed, is or may be an Indian child.
  - c) Providing notice to an Indian child's parents and tribe that the child is involved in proceedings that may culminate in an order for foster care placement, termination of parental rights, preadoptive placement, or

- adoptive placement, as specified, and prohibiting any such proceeding until 10 days after the notice was received.
- d) Granting the child's Indian tribe and Indian custodian the right to intervene at any point in an Indian child custody proceeding. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 224-224.6, 361.7.)
- 3) Establishes the juvenile court, which is intended to provide for the protection and safety of the public and minors falling under its jurisdiction. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 202, 245.)
  - 4) Provides that a child may become a dependent of the juvenile court and be removed from the custody of their parent or guardian<sup>1</sup> on the basis of enumerated forms of abuse or neglect. (Welf. Inst. Code, § 300(a)-(j).)
  - 5) Provides that, if a child is taken into temporary custody, the social worker must conduct, within 30 days, an investigation to identify and locate all grandparents, parents of a sibling of the child, if the parent has legal custody of the sibling, adult siblings, other adult relatives of the child, as defined, and, if there is reason to know that the child is an Indian child, any extended family members.
    - a) The social worker must provide any person so located of specified information, including information regarding the child's removal, how to become a resource family, and contact information for the child.
    - b) The social worker must use due diligence in investigating the names and locations of relatives, as specified, including "family finding," which means conducting an investigation that includes specified steps. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 309(e).)
  - 6) Requires, at the initial petition hearing on a petition to make a child a dependent of the juvenile court, the social worker to report to the court on topics including whether there are any relatives who are able and willing to take temporary physical custody of the child.
    - a) If it is known or there is reason to know the child is an Indian child, the social worker must include additional specified information relating to the county welfare department's active efforts to provide services and programs to prevent the breakup of the Indian family.
    - b) If the child is not released from custody, the court may order temporary placement of the child in the home of a relative, extended family member, as defined, or nonrelative extended family member who has been assessed; if the child is an Indian child, they shall be placed in accordance with the placement preferences set forth in ICWA unless the court finds good cause not to follow those preferences.

---

<sup>1</sup> Going forward, this analysis uses "parent" to include "guardian."

- c) Relatives shall be given preferential consideration for the temporary placement. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 319.)
- 7) Requires a court, at the dispositional hearing, to hear evidence on the question of the proper disposition of the child; as part of this determination, the court must receive in evidence a social study or evaluation made by the child's social worker or court-appointed child advocate that sets forth specified information, including whether the child can be returned to their parent's custody, the relationships between the child and any identified family members, information relating to the child's siblings, and, for an Indian child, whether tribal customary adoption may be appropriate.
  - a) If the child has been removed from their parent's custody, the court must make a finding as to whether the social worker has exercised due diligence in conducting the investigation under 5) to identify, locate, and notify the child's relatives, including maternal and paternal relatives. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 358, 358.1.)
- 8) Requires, at a hearing under 8), preferential consideration to be given to a request by a relative of the child for placement of the child with the relative, regardless of the relative's immigration status, or physical disability provided that the relative can exercise care and control over the child.
  - a) The social worker shall consider enumerated factors to determine whether placement with a relative is appropriate.
  - b) If the court does not place the child with a relative who has been considered, the court shall state for the record the reasons the placement was denied.
  - c) At each subsequent hearing, whenever a new placement of the child must be made, the court must give new consideration to relatives who have not been found to be unsuitable and who will fulfill the child's reunification or permanent plan requirements. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 361.3.)
- 9) Requires the juvenile court to review the status of every dependent child in foster care periodically, and no less frequently than every six months, at which point the court shall consider the child's placement and other enumerated factors. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366.)
- 10) Requires every supplemental report filed for a review hearing under 10) to include a factual discussion of specified subjects, including the recommended plan for the child and information about the child's health and education. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366.1.)
- 11) States that, when a placement in foster care is being made, placement shall, if possible, be made in the home of a relative, unless the placement would not be in the best interest of the child.

- a) An agency or other entity tasked with placing a child must make diligent efforts to locate a relative, as defined, to locate an appropriate hearing.<sup>2</sup>
- b) At the permanency hearing in which the court terminates reunification services, or at any postpermanency hearing for a child not placed for adoption, the court shall find that the agency or entity has made diligent efforts to locate an appropriate relative and that each relative whose name has been submitted as possible caretaker has been evaluated as an appropriate placement resource. (Fam. Code, § 7950.)

This bill:

- 1) Requires a juvenile court, at a status review hearing for a dependent child or nonminor dependent who is not residing with their relatives, kin, or an Indian custodian, to find whether the social worker has continued efforts, and in the case of an Indian child, the active efforts, to locate any relatives or kin who could provide family support or possible placement of the child or nonminor dependent and the names of those relatives of those or kin, and the results of those efforts.
- 2) Requires each supplemental report required to be filed at a status review hearing for a dependent child or nonminor dependent who is not residing with their relatives, kin, or an Indian custodian to include a factual discussion of the social worker's continued efforts, and in the case of an Indian child, the active efforts, to locate any relatives or kin who could provide family support or possible placement of the child or nonminor dependent and the names of those relatives of those or kin; the discussion must include documentation of the efforts and the results of those efforts.
- 3) Corrects a cross-reference in Family Code section 7950.

### COMMENTS

#### 1. Author's comment

According to the author:

In California, there are nearly 45,000 children in foster care, with over 55% of them Latino. Children in foster care have experienced abuse, neglect, and other adverse childhood experiences that can negatively impact their health. Research shows that children in the foster care system who are placed with relatives have greater placement and school stability, fewer emotional and behavioral problems in placement, and more connections to their biological family and social-cultural communities.

---

<sup>2</sup> Family Code section 7590's "diligent efforts" requirement currently cross-references the incorrect subdivision of Welfare and Institutions Code section 319. Amendments agreed to by the author in the Human Services Committee correct the cross-reference.

AB 2929 serves as a testament to our state’s commitment to advancing the well-being of our foster youth by promoting important and stable family connections. The positive impacts of reuniting foster children with their families are immeasurable and this bill aligns with our shared values of supporting countless vulnerable children who deserve every opportunity for success.

## 2. California’s foster population and the importance of family and tribal placements

The child welfare system is intended to achieve a delicate balance of values, including “protecting children from harm, preserving family ties, and avoiding unnecessary intrusion into family life.”<sup>3</sup> The overarching goal of dependency proceedings is to safeguard the welfare of California’s children.<sup>4</sup> As of January 2024, over 43,000 children and young adults were in foster care in California.<sup>5</sup> Black and Indigenous children are dramatically overrepresented in the foster care system, with rates of 17.1 and 15.8 children in care per 1,000 children, respectively.<sup>6</sup>

Despite the stated goal of protecting children, research shows “that foster care leads to poor human capital formation and a host of undesirable outcomes.”<sup>7</sup> The very first step of the process – removing a child from their parent’s custody – can lead to short- and long-term harms, including PTSD and substance abuse issues.<sup>8</sup> Foster children in California move placements, on average, 3.67 times every 1,000 days;<sup>9</sup> multiple placements are associated with attachment difficulties, decreased academic performance, and externalizing and internalizing behavioral problems.<sup>10</sup> These problems carry over into adulthood: a survey conducted by the University of Chicago’s Chapin Hall found that more than 25 percent of former foster youth in California reported experiencing at least one night of homelessness in the past two years, while

---

<sup>3</sup> *In re R.T.* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 622, 638.

<sup>4</sup> *In re Josiah Z.* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 664, 673.

<sup>5</sup> California Child Welfare Indicators Project, University of California at Berkeley, Report: Children in Foster Care, CWS/CMS 2023 Quarter 4 Extract (retrieved Jun. 20, 2024), available at <https://ccwip.berkeley.edu/childwelfare/reports/PIT/MTSG/r/ab636/s>. All links in this analysis are current as of June 20, 2024.

<sup>6</sup> California Child Welfare Indicators Project, University of California at Berkeley, Report: Children in Foster Care by Ethnic Group, CWS/CMS 2023 Quarter 4 Extract (retrieved Jun. 20, 2024), available at <https://ccwip.berkeley.edu/childwelfare/reports/InCareRates/MTSG/r/rts/s>. Latino children are in care at a rate of 5.3 children per 1,000; white children are in care at a rate of 3.4 children per 1,000; children of Asian and Pacific Islander descent are in care at a rate of .7 children per 1,000. (*Ibid.*) The rate for multiracial children is set at 0, which may reflect a data collection issue. (*Ibid.*)

<sup>7</sup> Lovett & Xue, *Family First of the Kindness of Strangers? Foster Care Placements and Adult Outcomes*, Labour Economics (Feb. 22, 2021), p. 1.

<sup>8</sup> E.g., Trivedi, *The Harm of Child Removal*, 43 N.Y.U. Rev. of Law & Social Change 523, 526, 528-532. (2019).

<sup>9</sup> California Child Welfare Indicators Project, University of California at Berkeley, Report: Children in Foster Care by Placement Stability, CWS/CMS 2023 Quarter 4 Extract (retrieved Jun. 20, 2024), available at <https://ccwip.berkeley.edu/childwelfare/reports/P5/MTSG/r/Fed/1>.

<sup>10</sup> McConnell, et al., *Changes in Placement among Children in Foster Care: A Longitudinal Study of Child and Case Influences*, Soc. Serv. Rev., 80(3) (Sept. 2006), p. 399.

nearly 30 percent said they had couch surfed by staying with friends because they lacked housing.<sup>11</sup>

One factor that has been shown to reduce negative experiences and outcomes for foster and former foster children is the placement of children in kinship placements, rather than in traditional foster placements with strangers.<sup>12</sup> “Compared to children that were placed in traditional foster care, former foster youth that were placed in kinship care are more likely to be employed or in school, less likely to be incarcerated, less likely to be homeless, and less likely to receive social welfare benefits.”<sup>13</sup>

For Indigenous children, federal and state law and state policy also require social workers and county welfare departments to make “active efforts” to locate members of the child’s family and members of the child’s tribe and grants placement preferences to members of the child’s tribe and other tribes.<sup>14</sup> This policy, implemented in the 1970s with the passage of ICWA, was “a direct response to the mass removal of Indian children from their families during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s by state officials and private parties,” which “was only the latest iteration of a much older policy of removing Indian children from their families.”<sup>15</sup> These efforts “had devastating effects on children and parents alike” and “presented an existential threat to the continued vitality of tribes.”<sup>16</sup> The United States Supreme Court recently upheld ICWA’s placement preferences,<sup>17</sup> which allows this State to continue its policies that recognize that “[i]t is in the best interest of an Indian child that the child’s membership or citizenship in the child’s Indian tribe and connection to the tribal community be encouraged and protected.”<sup>18</sup>

Current law requires a social worker to report on their efforts, or for an Indian child, active efforts, to locate family members for a potential placement at the initial hearing.<sup>19</sup> Current law also requires the social worker to report on efforts made to find a relative for a potential placement at the dispositional hearing; if the court concludes that the child will remain out of the custody of their parent, preferential consideration must be given to a request by a relative for placement of the child with that relative.<sup>20</sup> Current law does not, however, specifically require a social worker to report to the court on family finding efforts at subsequent hearings.

---

<sup>11</sup> Courtney, et al., *Findings from the California Youth Transitions to Adulthood Study (CalYOUTH): Conditions of youth at age 23 (2020)* Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago, pp. 18-19, available at [https://www.chapinhall.org/wp-content/uploads/CY\\_YT\\_RE1020.pdf](https://www.chapinhall.org/wp-content/uploads/CY_YT_RE1020.pdf).

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at p. 3.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> 25 U.S.C. § 1915; Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 224.1, 361.31.

<sup>15</sup> *Haaland v. Brackeen* (Jun. 15, 2023), 143 S.Ct. 1609, 1641 (conc. opn. of Gorsuch, J.)

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at p. 1623 (maj. opn. of Barrett, J.)

<sup>18</sup> Welf. & Inst. Code, § 224.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*, § 319.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*, §§ 358, 361.3.

3. AB 448 and the Governor's veto

Last year, the Legislature passed AB 448 (Carrillo, 2023), which would have imposed enhanced family finding requirements on the social worker or probation officer of a child who has been removed from the custody of their parents, with specific requirements for a child who may be an Indian child pursuant to ICWA. The bill also required a juvenile court to inquire into, and make findings regarding, the adequacy of those finding efforts, and to make additional findings relating to the adequacy of the county welfare department's efforts. This Committee passed AB 448, with minor amendments to clarify the scope of family finding efforts a social worker must conduct for a nonminor dependent, with a vote of 11-0.

Governor Newsom, however, vetoed AB 448. In his veto message, Governor Newsom cited cost concerns as the basis for his veto:

I am returning Assembly Bill 448 without my signature.

This bill would require a social worker to conduct a family-finding investigation to identify and locate adult relatives within 30 days after a child has been taken into temporary custody and would make changes to reporting and documentation requirements for social workers and probation officers.

My Administration recognizes the value of keeping children connected to their biological and extended families. Children placed with family members have greater placement stability, fewer emotional and behavioral problems, and more connection to their social-cultural communities. Existing law already requires that, if a child is removed from their home, the social worker or probation officer must, within 30 days, investigate to identify adult relatives of the child.

Last year's Budget Act allocated \$150 million General Fund for the Excellence in Family Finding, Engagement, and Support Program, which supports culturally responsive, family-centered, and trauma-informed family-finding and engagement services that focus on maintaining permanent connections for foster children with their family members. The new documentation requirements in this bill would result in ongoing General Fund costs of over \$6 million to support the increased administrative workload for county child welfare agencies and county probation departments. Though this policy has merit, its costs must be considered as part of the annual budget process.

In partnership with the Legislature, we enacted a budget that closed a shortfall of more than \$30 billion through balanced solutions that avoided



deep program cuts and protected education, health care, climate, public safety, and social service programs that are relied on by millions of Californians. This year, however, the Legislature sent me bills outside of this budget process that, if all enacted, would add nearly \$19 billion of unaccounted costs in the budget, of which \$11 billion would be ongoing. With our state facing continuing economic risk and revenue uncertainty, it is important to remain disciplined when considering bills with significant fiscal implications, such as this measure.

For these reasons, I cannot sign this bill.<sup>21</sup>

4. This bill requires a social worker to report on, and for a court to make findings related to, the social worker's efforts to find a relative placement at a status review hearing

This bill is another effort to ensure that adequate efforts are made to locate a placement for a child with a relative, extended family member, or nonrelative extended family member, though it is more modest than AB 448 in response to the Governor's veto. AB 2929 imposes two related requirements in connection with a status review hearing of a child or nonminor dependent who does not reside with relatives, other family members, or an Indian custodian:

- At the status review hearing, the court must determine whether the social worker has continued efforts to locate any relatives or others who could provide family support or a possible placement of the child or nonminor dependent. If the child is an Indian child, the court must find whether the social worker has continued active efforts to locate relatives or kin, consistent with ICWA.
- In advance of the status review hearing, the social worker must include in its supplemental report the continued effort they have made to locate any relatives or others who could provide family support or possible placement of the child or nonminor dependent and the names of those relatives or other individuals; the report must document those efforts and the results of those efforts. If the child is an Indian child, the social worker must document their active efforts, consistent with ICWA.

As currently in print, the bill refers to a child's "kin"; the author has agreed to amend the bill to replace that term with references to nonrelative family members and, in the case of an Indian child, extended family members, to conform the bill's terminology to the terms defined in the Welfare and Institutions Code.

Given that a social worker's search for relatives should be ongoing at the status review hearing, it does not appear that this bill imposes a significant new burden on social workers. In many cases, supplemental reports should already include this information,

---

<sup>21</sup> Governor's veto message to Assem. on Assem. Bill No. 448 (Oct. 8, 2023) Assem. Recess Journal No. 11 (2023-2024 Reg. Sess.) p. 3691.

given that a court at a status review hearing is required to consider the appropriateness of the child's placement.<sup>22</sup>

## 5. Amendments

As noted above, the author has agreed to amend the bill to delete the term "kin" and replace it with references to nonrelative family members and, in the case of an Indian child, extended family members. Unlike "kin," these terms are defined in the Welfare and Institutions Code and will provide clearer guidance to the social workers and courts tasked with implementing this bill.

## 6. Arguments in support.

According to the California Tribal Families Coalition:

Both state and federal law include a preference to place children in out-of-home care with relatives. For example, California Welfare and Institutions Code Section 361.3, states that preferential consideration must be given to a request by a relative of the child for placement of the child with the relative. Numerous nationwide studies have documented the poor outcomes of children and youth who are removed from their homes and placed into the child welfare system. Children involved with the child welfare system have increased rates of chronic health problems, developmental delays and disabilities, mental health needs, and substance abuse problems.

Studies have also demonstrated the significant benefit to children in the child welfare system that are placed with relatives rather than with strangers in foster homes or in group care. A 2008 study in the Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine found that children placed into kinship care had fewer behavioral problems three years after placement than children who were placed into foster care. This study also noted that a large body of research acknowledges the evidence that children in kinship care are less likely to change placements, benefiting from increased placement stability and better outcomes. Researchers also found that children placed with relatives were more likely to remain in their same neighborhood, be placed with siblings, and have consistent contact with their birth parents than other children in foster care.

Delay in relative engagement often means that the relative will not be selected as placement for the child. Fact finding hearings can sometimes take months to complete with placement decisions at times taking over a year. During this time, the child could be placed with a family and developing strong connections all while a relative may have a home ready and waiting for the child. AB 2929 seeks

---

<sup>22</sup> Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366; *see also id.*, § 366.21.

to avoid these unnecessary delays by ensuring all parties involved in the child welfare case (attorneys, judicial officers) will have the information necessary to facilitate meaningful and ongoing connections between the youth and their family.

### **SUPPORT**

Children’s Law Center of California (sponsor)  
A New Way of Life Reentry Project  
Alliance for Children’s Rights  
California Alliance of Caregivers  
California CASA  
California Tribal Families Coalition  
County Welfare Directors Association  
Dependency Advocacy Center  
Families Inspiring Reentry & Reunification 4 Everyone  
John Burton Advocates for Youth  
Judicial Council of California  
Los Angeles Dependency Lawyers, Inc.  
Public Counsel  
Stanislaus Family Counselors  
Starting Over, Inc.  
Youth Law Center

### **OPPOSITION**

None received

### **RELATED LEGISLATION**

#### **Pending Legislation:**

AB 3217 (Bryan, 2024) requires each county, on an annual basis, to review publicly available data comparing the statewide national average rate of placing children with relatives in the prior year for comparison with the county’s placement rate during the same period and for counties to take specified actions based on the results. AB 3217 is pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

SB 824 (Ashby, 2023) expands the Department of Social Services’ (DSS) authority to grant an exemption to restrictions on a person serving as a resource family for a specific child when that person has a criminal conviction, to permit DSS to grant an exception to a person who is an extended family member or a nonrelative extended family member, provided that DSS finds the exemption is justified and other specified conditions are met. SB 824 is pending before the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Prior Legislation:

AB 448 (Juan Carrillo, 2023) would have required a social worker to conduct an investigation to locate family members or members of a child's tribe for a child who is a dependent or ward or the juvenile court immediately, but in no case in fewer than 30 days from the date of removal, and would have required a social workers to include information about their ongoing efforts to locate family members or members of the child's tribe in its reports to the court. AB 448 was vetoed by Governor Newsom; the veto message, along with a more thorough discussion of AB 448, is set forth in Part 3 of this analysis.

SB 384 (Cortese, Ch. 811, Stats. 2022) required county welfare departments and probation departments to notify the DSS, on or before January 1, 2024, as to whether it has adopted certain suggested practices for family finding and whether the practice has been implemented, and specified what efforts constitute due diligence in family finding.

SB 354 (Skinner, Ch. 687, Stats. 2021) among other things, authorized a juvenile court to order the placement of a child with a relative, regardless of the status of any criminal exemption or resource family approval, if the court finds that the placement does not pose a risk to the health and safety of the child.

AB 686 (Waldron, Ch. 434, Stats. 2019) required, when a tribe does not exercise its right to approve a home for a specific dependent Indian child, the county and foster family agency to apply prevailing social and cultural standards of the Indian community when approving a resource family for that child.

**PRIOR VOTES:**

Senate Human Services Committee (Ayes 4, Noes 0)  
Assembly Floor (Ayes 71, Noes 0)  
Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 15, Noes 0)  
Assembly Human Services Committee (Ayes 6, Noes 0)  
Assembly Judiciary Committee (Ayes 12, Noes 0)

\*\*\*\*\*