

May 22, 1995

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Vrtiska, how long have you known Mr. Pearson?

SENATOR VRTISKA: Not very long.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: What do you know about him? What do you know about his record on the Patrol?

SENATOR VRTISKA: I don't know anything about him. I just know that he was in the Patrol and he's worked his way up through the ranks and apparently has been an outstanding individual as far as law enforcement is concerned. And how long have you known him?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you know that he is suitable for the board, based on your own personal experience and knowledge of him?

SENATOR VRTISKA: I don't know any more than you...probably than you know that he's not suitable.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, so then you don't have a reason for saying he should be on the board other than because he worked his way up through the ranks and used to be with the State Patrol. Is that basically correct?

SENATOR VRTISKA: Well, the only reason I heard you say that he wasn't suitable is because he happened to be a patrolman and you felt like that he wasn't suitable, which indicates to me that you are somewhat discriminatory in your attitude toward...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I don't want...I don't want too many people from law enforcement. That's my reasoning, but yours does not even have that much of a basis. Thank you, Senator Vrtiska. Members of the Legislature, I know and everybody knows that these nominations are not opposed. There are people on the Judiciary Committee who have concerns but not one of them will utter a word on the floor about it. Somebody has got to call attention to the fact that appointments of this kind are being made and that they are inappropriate. When 40 percent of the makeup of the board consists of law enforcement persons, that is an undue imbalance. Senator Vrtiska, if he was in the military or in the...worked with the police, knows that a lot of times people work their way up through the ranks based on political considerations anyway. It's not always merit. He doesn't know