

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

April 10, 2003      LB 265A

thank you for putting this into the bill. But I still wanted to discuss it. Because there are people supporting this bill who don't even know what it says. And I want to tell you all something else. I would not get a permit to carry a pistol. But if I decide I want to carry one concealed, I would come under the existing law. And if I can show under the existing law a reason for carrying that pistol and I have no permit to carry it, then I can carry it under circumstances that you with a permit cannot carry.

SPEAKER BROMM: Time. Senator Chambers, your light is next though.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. I would have burst if I couldn't continue on this one. (Laugh) I'm on a roll. This bill specifically says that a permit holder is not covered by the existing statute that relates to carrying a concealed weapon. If I'm carrying a concealed weapon now, I'm in violation of the law. But a complete defense against conviction is if I can show a reason why I'm carrying it. So Senator Tyson is carrying a pistol pursuant to the permit law. I'm carrying a concealed pistol without a permit. And we both get arrested. And Senator Tyson had come from church, and they can detect alcohol in his system. He's in violation of the law. I have alcohol on my breath. But that does not come into play, because I'm not a permit carrier. All I have to do is show that I was justified in carrying that pistol. And I will show that I had been given threats against my life, I had filed police reports, and attempts had been made against me. Or I'm carrying money that has to be deposited. Any number of justifications have been offered and accepted. So I, without a permit, carried a concealed weapon with alcohol on my breath, and I am exonerated. Senator Tyson, with a permit, but with alcohol on his breath, is in violation of the law. And these people who want to carry this gun pursuant to a permit think they're getting something? Think they can do more under this law than they can do under the existing law? Let them think it. But it shows that they haven't read this bill, they don't understand the existing law, and they don't understand how this bill interacts with the existing law. And probably nobody on the floor is paying attention now. But there are people outside this Legislature