

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

January 20, 2006 LB 72

respond to, if you want to. It is your intent that these items be a required part, is that true?

SENATOR STUHR: Are you talking about starting with line 22 or 25?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR STUHR: Yes, we are talking about minimum guidelines, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So changing that "may" to "shall" would not change what your intent is?

SENATOR STUHR: I don't believe it would.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. Thank you. Members of the Legislature, if I just wanted to kill the bill, then that...I wouldn't be doing it this way. I wouldn't even take the time. But I believe the legislation...some kind of legislation in this area is necessary. Senator Stuhr did a little checking, and she found out that many, many years ago I had attempted to bring legislation to regulate this area. It was not successful. Little that I offered in those days was successful, if memory serves me correctly. But because I know Senator Stuhr is serious and sincere, I'm going to work this bill over with that in mind. But I still have to exact the Ernie tax. And if I were as miffed with her today as I was when she voted for those cloture motions on two of the worst bills that have come before us this session--Senator Michael Foley's for one, Senator Jeanne Combs' for the other--then I would be harrying, hounding, harassing, and ripping this bill to shreds. And it would be easy. There is so much in it that I think is surplusage, and I'm going to try to persuade Senator Stuhr and others as we proceed that some of what is in the bill can be eliminated without harming the thrust of the bill at all. That doesn't mean we do away with minimum standards for training. It doesn't mean we'll do away with education. There are a lot of general principles which I think are valid. But as people have often said, the devil is in the details. Now, they say that; that's not true. Having close acquaintanceship with that one, that