things out to you as we go along. This bill hasn't got any business even being considered for Select File. However, I will get back to my amendment. My amendment doesn't do any damage to the bill. It makes it fair on one end and it's just as fair on the other. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Ashford, please.

SENATOR ASHFORD: Thank you, Mr. President, and members, Senator Haberman mentioned that, in his first amendment, that he didn't feel it appropriate for urban senators or an urban... "urban" bill to be thrust upon senators from greater Nebraska. guess we feel that... I am sure Senator Haberman, when he requests the legislation he does for his constituents and asks urban senators to support them, support it, I think is interesting that he would tell us that we should do...suggest to him that there is legislation that may emanate from an urban area which could positively be good public policy for the state as a whole. But let me talk a little bit about the bill and what he has suggested. He says the bill is poorly written and he cites as an example the written notification provision. The reason that it's written the way it is is this. We require that there be registered mail, return receipt requested, or hand delivery, so that there is proof that this notification of transfer has been duly sent. It is not necessary that the return be registered mail or return receipt requested because what the bill says that if law enforce...that if the gun dealer is not informed within seven days of any objection to the transfer, that the gun dealer may transfer the weapon. So why make it any more onerous than it has to be? The reason the bill is written the way it is is, one, to provide that there be record of notice sent by return receipt requested or hand delivery; number two, that it not be necessary that the notice be by return receipt requested going back to make it less onerous on the gun dealer and the purchaser. So that's...there is a very good reason why it was written that way. Secondarily, Senator Haberman is continually talking about the fact that this bill denies people the right to go hunting coyotes and birds and whatever it may be, and he uses an example, handicapped persons. Now, obviously, obviously, that is not correct. The bill talks about a seven-day waiting period. And if he has a better way to define a handgun, I would be more than happy to look at that definition, but that is the definition that is used throughout the country in defining handguns. And...but if he has a better definition other than a weapon that is designed for use by one