

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Beyer. Senator Schimek.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, Madam President, and members of the body, I feel a need to stand and explain how I am going to vote on this issue. I am going to support Senator Chambers' bracket motion even though, Senator Beyer, and I have already talked with you about this, even though I was one of the five committee members who did vote this bill out of committee. I think that Senator Chambers has raised enough significant and bothersome issues that the bill does need to be reworked, and the question becomes then, do we have enough time to do that in this session? There are, at last...last time I checked, there are 12 members of this body who are excused right now, and I am not certain that even if we tried to move this bill today that we would be able to do it. I just don't know. I am questioning that we would be able to do it. I am not sure there is enough votes here to do that. And, you know, rather than trying to do that, I think the better action would be to support this bracket motion. I think Senator Chambers is sincere when he says that he is not against the concept. I certainly support you on that. I think that you've worked long and hard on this issue. I understand your wanting to get the legislation taken care of while you are still here because you know that you have the will and the drive to go ahead and see it through to completion. But I would just say to you, I think there are enough others of us in this body who are interested in the issue that it won't die, and so I guess I would make that pledge to you, and I would certainly be willing to serve on that committee. I think it is an area that needs regulation. Most areas do today. So, therefore, I just wanted to explain to you why I am going to vote the way I am. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Pirsch.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Madam President. I will not support the bracket motion. I did talk to Professor Kuchel at the University of Nebraska-Omaha, who was one of the opponents, and asked him quite frankly why he was opposed to it. He was not opposed to tightening, to changing. What he was concerned with was that the training could be the low-paid intern for the agencies, in other words that this would be a training possibility where they could get a low-paid entry person and that would be considered the training. He feels, of course, very strongly, and probably because of his position in criminal