

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR ASHFORD: ...that we can enforce these laws. At the latest hearing on LB 642, Attorney General Spire said in the testimony, I quote, "I do not believe that this legislation, that being the seven-day waiting period, would violate the new Nebraska right to bear arms constitutional amendment. Our State Supreme Court has just ruled that this amendment does not prevent 'reasonable' regulation of gun ownership and possession by the Legislature." So the Supreme Court, in its wisdom, has given to us, the legislative body, the right to make decisions on what we believe to be reasonable regulation in this area. So I would concur with Senator Chizek that LB 642 is a type of regulation which is, I believe, reasonable and would fall...would be declared to be constitutional under the three Supreme Court...it's not very often that we would have three Supreme Court decisions so quickly rendered that would give us such a clear guideline on how we can deal with gun legislation.

PRESIDENT: Time.

SENATOR ASHFORD: So, with that, I would ask that the committee amendments be voted down. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Wesely is next, followed by Senator Hefner and Senator Chambers.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Mr. President and members, I would rise in opposition to the committee amendments as well, though I must say with mixed feelings. I did have a study done of the constitutional amendment before it was adopted and that study by the Research Office clearly indicated problems with the amendment, the wording, the extent of it, the broad, vague language that was included. It had many people concerned. Judges followed and interpreted that language, as Senator Ashford said, in a very direct fashion. They used common sense in reading what that language said and threw out some different convictions and different statutes that we had long held in the state. But, eventually, it was discovered by the Supreme Court that what something says doesn't necessarily mean what it says, that it means something other than that, and they are disregarding the language of that constitutional amendment. I say, amen to them, because that amendment I think was a mistake in the first place. But Senator Haberman would have you now go back to that issue and I suggest that we not do that. The issue