

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

January 15, 2004 LB 75

on qualification, in terms of not being or being a lawyer. But many people feel there are other things that would disqualify me. The only reason I'm saying that is because I have a difficult time looking at a job that is to be done which requires certain abilities and carries certain responsibilities, and if those are going to be laid on everybody who's going to do that job except if they're in a place where there are not many people, why should those fewer people have somebody less qualified than where there are more people? Or why should there not be at least technical qualifications that have to be met by anybody who is going to be a sheriff? I don't even know why there are sheriffs, except that the law requires them, and there used to be sheriffs in England. But I need to ask Senator Schimek a question now, in view of other things that have been said.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Would you yield to a question, Senator Schimek?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Certainly.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Schimek, are there people, if this amendment is adopted, who can be a sheriff without taking that law enforcement training which currently is required?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I'm not sure that I get your question, because I'm not sure that you're asking it quite right. Ask it again, would you, Senator?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. This dumbbell that everybody is talking about but won't mention, who could not successfully complete the training at the Law Enforcement Training Center, so he couldn't be sheriff...

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Then that person could not be sheriff.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is this amendment changing that set of circumstances so such an individual could qualify to be sheriff without taking that training?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: No.