

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

January 23, 2006 LB 72

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, you can look at that...

SENATOR STUHR: I...if I...I will find that for you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, then, I will proceed with what I'm doing and not drop that on you and expect you to be able to give me the answer right now. Members of the Legislature, let me tell you what this amendment would do. On page 2, in line 10, it says that a permit is given to a licensed security officer, following the completion of the application process. It is not given under the law; it is issued. To be given something connotes the notion of a gift or largess. This is a matter of a person being required to meet certain standards, and once those standards are met there is the issuance of a permit. So this amendment would strike the words "that is given," and substitute the single word "issued." The language would then read, security officer firearms permit means a permit that is issued to a licensed...oh, a permit issued to a licensed security officer, and so forth. I think this is an amendment which is appropriate. I have another amendment for this area of the bill, still on line 10. It says, this permit issues, following the completion of an application process. A process can be completed without the person meeting the requirements, and therefore, he or she can be said, in the vernacular, to have flunked. So this language should say that a permit issues, following the successful completion of an application process, in the same way that in lines 13 and 14 we have the language, "upon the submission and approval of evidence of successfully completing" this firearms training program. The idea that this must be successfully done is necessary; otherwise, all a person has to do is go through the process. If that means giving my name, address, whatever else they want, paying a registration fee or whatever the bill requires, that completes the application process. And if that is completed, give me my permit to carry a pistol. But I know that's not Senator Stuhr's intent; I'm pretty sure it's not. So as we get further along this morning or tomorrow or the next day, or the next, we will get to that point, also. My understanding is that this bill has been in the works for more than one year, more than two years, perhaps as much as three years. I don't know who was writing