

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

April 1, 2003 LB 265

position at that time was a very tentative position. I had voted to advance the bill because I wanted to hear a very thorough and a very honest debate on this question because I was not in the Legislature the last time this bill came to the floor, several years ago. And at this point in the debate I'd have to say that my vote is winnable by either side, although, based on what I heard yesterday, I have a very strong inclination now to vote for cloture and to vote for advancement of the bill. I don't find it very persuasive to hear scare tactics about drunken 21-year-olds. I don't find it very persuasive to hear threats about the return of the Wild Wild West. I'm not particularly impressed by amendments that seek to change the name of the concealed carry bill to the kill your neighbor bill. I don't want to hear that John Lott is a liar. I've never read John Lott's book. No one is quoting John Lott here on the floor. I don't care if he is a liar. In fact, when I hear all of that, I can only come to the conclusion that the opponents of this bill must have a very shallow argument if that's the best they can do. So, at least for now, I think Senator Tyson has the better argument. Yesterday, he said something along the lines of in a free society the burden of proving the need to restrict liberties rests with those who want to make that restriction. So my question to the opponents of this bill is what is the compelling public policy reason for restricting the liberties of law-abiding citizens? If you want to win my vote, that's the argument that I need to hear, and you've got to set forth a pretty compelling case. If 43 states, or something like that, now have concealed carry laws in some form, and they're not having problems with it, then that means a lot to me. And when the law enforcement community changes their position from strong opposition to the bill to a new position of neutrality on the bill, by and large, that means a lot to me as well. So if Senator Chambers and others are holding a few aces in their hand, I would respectfully suggest that this morning would be a good time to play them, because what they offered yesterday was pretty shallow. Unless I hear a better argument, I'm going to vote for cloture and for advancement of this bill, at least on the first round. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Foley. On with discussion, Senator Chambers, followed by Senators Thompson, and