

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Bohlke. Senator Dierks.

SENATOR DIERKS: Thank you, Madam President, and members of the body, I guess I'm wondering what the worst all-time bill was on Senator Bernard-Stevens' list. I suspect maybe it had to do with smokeless tobacco but I'm not sure. It's nice to see that we're being consistent anyway. In answer to your question about the length of time that it takes for this check, Senator Bernard-Stevens, it's...we don't have to have this report back, we don't have to have the results back prior to the hiring. Hiring can be done on a provisional basis so it isn't all that essential that the results are back right away. It's a matter of finding the information as it is available. I guess that I have some problems with this amendment from the standpoint that it looks to me like it's simply a method of harassing the bill. I don't have any objections to asking these people to be checked. I don't think there is any problem with that. I think we've made it kind of all-encompassing with this amendment though and I don't think it's necessary. The thing we're trying to do is to provide some safety for the students that we have in this state. It is difficult for me to understand why teachers would object because it appears to me that it would provide them with a certain sense of security to know that this has been done. I just have difficulty with the fact that the teachers would object to this. I think we should defuse one of the things that was mentioned and that's the fact that the fingerprints seem to be scaring people. We require fingerprint checks for a number of things and it's really not all that difficult or all that dangerous nor is it indicative of criminal activity. It's just a method of providing us with information as we need it and I think that it is a very reliable and very effective method of getting information for us. The...I'm trying to remember what the question was that Senator Bernard-Stevens asked as he was being called out of time. I guess I've forgotten. I'll let him come back and ask again. But as far as the amendment that Senator Crosby has brought, I just guess I feel like it's strictly one of harassing the bill and I don't think it's necessary. I think that if these people that she's talking about are going to be dealing with our students, they wouldn't even object to being cleared by the national check. Actually, if they are part of a government subdivision providing services to students, then they could be required to go through the check. If you're talking about professional services that are offered through the ESU, for instance, or, for instance, psychiatric or speech therapy or