

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

January 23, 2006    LB 72

have to comply with before they can become a licensed security guard.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But anybody who meets those requirements, whether a cop or not, will all be on the same footing, and will not have to take additional training.

SENATOR STUHR: That's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is that your intent?

SENATOR STUHR: That's, you know, that is the intent.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And on my closing, when I get to that, I have another question I'd like to ask you, but I will stop for now. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Schimek, on FA359 to LB 72.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes, thank you, Mr. President and members. I rise in support of LB 72 and I reiterate, I think this bill is a good bill. It is something that is necessary, and I don't think I've heard yet on the floor that it isn't a good bill overall. There might be a few minor amendments that need to be made. I'm not sure that I agree with all of Senator Chambers' amendments. I think this first one, I believe, is the one on "issue," and I have no problem with that, and I'm guessing that Senator Stuhr doesn't have any problem with that, and I think we should adopt it and move on. Some of the others down the line I think are not necessary. They probably wouldn't hurt the bill, but I don't think they're necessary. The next one, regarding the successful completion of an application process, well, either you complete it or you don't. And if you complete it, it's a successful completion, so I think that's a little nonsensical. As you move on down further, I would disagree about the grammatical change. I don't think we need to make that. I think "services" is plural, and so I think you leave "mean" as "mean" and don't change it to "means." I would hope that we could move this bill along today. I don't think it's of huge controversy. I think it's one that we could be working on off