

asking and only what I am asking.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Sure.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: What do you think ought to exist in the way of education for these people?

SENATOR PIRSCH: Actually, I would have no idea. I would think that the Crime Commission, the Patrol, and the detective involved in that should know, certainly better than I.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And they should know better than I, but what guidance or direction is in the bill that even says they have to give anything that pertains directly to what would achieve these goals?

SENATOR PIRSCH: Well, as you know, I have no other interest in this bill except to ask questions of Senator Beyer for what is happening now. And if this bill, indeed, improves what is happening now, because as I understand, the Secretary of State does a background check and anybody can walk up and get a license.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, and I don't disagree with that, but, Senator Pirsch, this is apparently the first time that an attempt is being made to deal with this profession or trade, or whatever it is comprehensively. Do you think it would be unreasonable to have more study undertaken before we put in place a comprehensive plan, especially when you look at all the groups that have been exempted, and I don't think all of them are covered by federal law, like security guards, and in-house investigators, without saying in the statute...

SENATOR PIRSCH: That's true, but I don't think they are covered now, Senator Chambers. Let me just ask you a question.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: On your time because mine is going to run out, and I don't mind answering.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Okay, well, your question was do I think that those people should be exempted?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Again, I don't know. I didn't hear the bill,