

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

March 5, 2004            LB 75

what the tests were that they failed on. I really don't feel like I can support this type of legislation. Where will we stop at? Right now I don't think judges have to be lawyers. Do legislators have to be lawyers? Where are we going to draw the line at for your qualifications before you get there? So I kind of question this type of legislation. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Louden. Senator Chambers, you're recognized on...I'm sorry, but there is...I'm sorry, Senator Chambers. There is a motion on the desk. Mr. Clerk. Senator Chambers, you may speak. I recognize you, so you may speak, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I may...thank you. Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I've been puzzling over what Senator Bourne brought up. And I thought he would get an answer. Here's what I'm wondering. And then I have other questions too. If the purpose of this is to say that a person has received a background check within a year of filing, then everything is all right. But then that next sentence that says "The candidate shall apply," maybe after the word "Patrol" in line 13 they should put a comma or a semicolon and insert the word "otherwise." Then it would read, if I can fit it in: within one calendar year prior to the deadline for filing the candidate filing form...(laugh) it's not quite hanging together. But if they put the word "otherwise" after "Patrol" it would mean that that the person is okay if he or she has gotten that background check within a year; otherwise the candidate shall apply for the background investigation at least 30 days prior to the filing deadline. Then you don't have two separate notions here. I'm not...Mr. President, I'm not giving up my time, but I want to have a word with Senator Hudkins.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Your time is rolling.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Brown is putting together an amendment that would address this issue. But now I have another question that is more preliminary to that one. Why is a person who has a law enforcement officer certificate or diploma excused from having to comply with the production of this letter from the Law Enforcement Training Center?