

Senator Scofield and Senator McFarland.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, on the committee statement, I'm there listed as voting no. And the reason I voted no was because the bill had been amended to become a repealer for that constitutional provision. Now, I don't like that constitutional provision but that's not what is before us today, but my reason for voting against the bill in committee was because it had been converted to a repealer. So I am going to vote against the constitu...the committee amendment and because we can get that off is the reason that I added my name as a co-sponsor when Senator Ashford asked me would I do so.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Scofield, please.

SENATOR SCOFIELD: Mr. President and members, I'm going to...I'm going to support the committee amendments and I want to give you an explanation why. It seems to me that there is a lot of confusion surrounding this bill. I am not confused how I'm going to vote on this bill. I intend to oppose 642. But it appears to me that the bill was used and, well, it doesn't appear it was explained it was used as a vehicle to address a problem that I think everyone of us was concerned about at the time and that was, what was the court's ruling, particularly in North Platte, what effect did that have on our ability to regulate felons in possession of firearms? Obviously, in light of the decisions that Senator Ashford has mentioned, the whole playing field has changed and now we have a bill out there that is about to become a vehicle to do who knows what. And I, personally, don't feel very comfortable with that. I don't...I can't read the individual members of the committee's minds about what their intention was when they voted the bill out. Some of them have spoken, some of them have not. But it seems to me that, given the stage we are in the session, that it would be wiser to have a clear direction coming out of the committee and this bill doesn't have it. It's been shot out of there with one intention and now, in light of court decisions, doesn't have seem to have the mission that it originally had when it was advanced. And I would prefer to wait on this issue and let it have a real hearing again next year if that's the desire of Senator Ashford to reintroduce it and go from there. But I would prefer not to proceed with this lack of direction and I think the bill could go any number of ways and the likelihood of a good negotiation would not be due to the lack of skill on