

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

February 6, 2006 LB 778

et cetera, and only after satisfactory proof of such qualification has been presented to the board. That provision that's in existing law, which you have not changed, seems to require that everybody has to furnish evidence of good reputation. Wouldn't that be accurate?

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: Correct.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. If that's the case, and if that existing provision covers the taking of exams, why do we need an independent provision with respect to proof of good reputation, especially when that provision says, at the request of the board? In other words, I like better the existing 2227 provision that says everybody provides it, rather than putting it at the will of the board to pick and choose as to who might be required to give evidence of good reputation. Or maybe I've set up a false dichotomy. Is there any explanation of how these two things can be read together?

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: I believe the addition of that line that you referenced in this particular section is point-blank to the restored...the felony conviction or the rights have been restored, would be directing the reproof back to that particular incident, since it's already in state statute that everybody has to have good standing.

SENATOR BEUTLER: So the provision...with respect...all right, so you're saying that that subparagraph on lines 15 and 16 on page 53 apply to the two previous lines, 13 and 14. Is that what you're saying?

SENATOR LANGEMEIER: I think it's a restatement to line...to the previous two lines, correct.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, so only those who have been convicted of a felony furnish satisfactory proof of good reputation?

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, even if they're convicted of a felony, don't they still have to do that, under 2227?