

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

January 11, 2006 LB 454

not...actually, I'm not sure I have time, Mr. President, so I think I'll wait with that and cede the rest of my time to the Chair.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Further discussion on the motion to recommit, offered by Senator Chambers? There are no further lights on. Senator Chambers, I'll recognize you to close on your motion.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I'm looking at things in this bill even as we discuss a motion such as this. On page 9, it talks about a permitholder carrying a concealed weapon and having contact with a peace officer or emergency service personnel, and it says in this bill that the emergency service personnel may secure the weapon from the permitholder if they think that it is necessary for the safety of any person present. Can you imagine some emergency service personnel being trained that there are people out there carrying concealed weapons and if an occasion arises where one of these people is on the scene and you think he or she poses a danger, their eyes going in circles in opposite direction, they're frothing at the mouth and they're trembling, they're muttering in a foreign language or speaking tongues, you've got to take that weapon from that person. This is crazy. Why even suggest that an emergency service personnel is going to have to disarm somebody who poses a danger? And the language they use is "may secure." That should be stricken. Don't even suggest at the outer reaches of the duty of an emergency service personnel that the disarming of a dangerous person may fit within that duty of that ESP. But here's where they don't write or draft with consistency. It talks about contact with an officer or the emergency service personnel, but when it says that a determination has been made that there is no danger, no threat to the safety of any person present, then the officer shall return the gun to the peace holder...the permitholder. But it doesn't say what the emergency service personnel shall do. They should at least have parallel drafting. If, in the paragraph above, it lays out a duty for two categories of persons, when you get to the second paragraph dealing with the same thing, you should state what is to happen under certain circumstances when both of those categories are involved. But