

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

January 20, 2006 LB 72

SENATOR STUHR: Yes, I don't know. Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...but I'm just pointing out some of the things that I'm thinking about when I look at what the bill allows, because I'm not sure that I want security guards to be carrying concealed weapons. You gave a very limited, narrow application and made it proprietary, but there's nothing in the bill that would limit it to that. They could drive with it. They could go anyplace. And if Senator Stuhr's bill were in effect, the security guards still could probably go places where that bill would stop these idiotic nitwits that I've been talking about from going. Might that be possible?

SENATOR STUHR: Anything is possible.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So the language would have to make it clear in that area what limitations might apply if somebody is going to carry a weapon concealed.

SENATOR STUHR: I thought that we had appropriate language, but we are willing to, you know, to look at it again.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. Thank you. And I'm looking at it, too, but I won't try to do all of that today. I'm just mentioning some of the things that I find problematic. I support legislation such as this because the existence of security guards has been established and entrenched to such an extent that the...

PRESIDENT SHEEHY: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...activity will not be banned by the Legislature. Maybe it shouldn't. But as regulation is being put in place, I want to restrict, as much as possible, what these people can do and cut down the likelihood that innocent people are going to be harmed. When I read all of the requirements and restrictions that are contained in this bill, there still is no guarantee, as there never can be, that you're not going to get some nut who just hasn't yet been certified to be a nut. This bill talks about somebody having been certified,