

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

January 20, 2006 LB 72

SENATOR CHAMBERS: It seems that we would not be talking about those in uniform, because the purpose of the uniform is to serve notice to the public that here stands a person who is protecting people or property, and the state has allowed that person to carry a death-dealing implement to carry that out, so the uniformed people probably would be carrying side arms that are visible. Would you agree?

SENATOR STUHR: That's probably true.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. And I don't see anything in the bill that would indicate the contrary, but I want to take it step by step for the record. The ones who will be carrying concealed weapons are those dressed in ordinary or plain clothes, as the language says in the bill. Is that correct?

SENATOR STUHR: Yes, it is.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: This next question does not need a definitive answer, but to the extent that you could answer it at this point, I would appreciate it if you would. Where would one of these people be working who is going to carry a concealed weapon while wearing ordinary clothes? Or, rather than me ask you where will he or she be working, what are the circumstances that would justify or make that necessary?

SENATOR STUHR: I'm not sure, but it might be in a...the proprietary circumstances. Let's say Borsheim's jewelry, they may have someone, you know, walking around in ordinary clothing. That might be a situation,...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Would it be fair...

SENATOR STUHR: ...in protection of resources, of personal resources, of the company's resources.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Would it be fair to say that if I were going to stick up Borsheim's, I could be described as a desperado?

SENATOR STUHR: Yes.