

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

March 13, 2006

LB 454, 1175

SENATOR CUDABACK: You've heard the opening on the motion to recommit to committee. Open for discussion on that motion. Senator Friend, followed by Senators Chambers and Brown. Senator Friend.

SENATOR FRIEND: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Legislature, again. The recommit motion, I would respond this way: There's better ways and more efficient ways to kill something than recommitting it to committee. I would say absolutely not. I've had that happen to me before. And I think personally, it's not a personal slap in the face to me. But I'll tell you this--the committee, we didn't just sit in these hearings for our health. We didn't kick these...we didn't listen to these people and analyze this stuff for our health. We did it, and then we did the work. We analyzed it, we did the work, put this stuff together as a committee, and moved it out to the floor. I agree with it. I agree with him. We either move forward or we kill this thing. But this is the wrong thing to do. A recommit motion has happened once, to the best of my knowledge, in the last four years, and it happened to the Urban Affairs Committee, and I let it happen. I let it happen. You know,...and I live with that. But this shouldn't happen. Throw a different motion up, throw an IPP motion up. We can vote on something like that. I mean, that seems...there is an argument to be made. He just made it. Senator Chambers just made it, that this is bad or could potentially be bad public policy. We're actually going down that road now. We're talking about it. What I would say, and I already did, this bill is fairly innocuous. I'm not apologizing for that. That's a good reason that the bill should pass. Senator Combs spent two days on LB 454, conceal and carry. It should take a long time to get something like that through. It should take two years. You know how long something like this should take? Less than that. It shouldn't take that long. It's because this is innocuous that it should pass. And his argument in response to it is very simple, as far as I'm concerned--Senator Chambers--is that...he says this is bad public policy. Well, then we better go back into committee next year and tell Omaha and tell Hastings and tell everybody else that they can't do it, either, because the public policy right now is that we can do it. The only ones that can't is Lincoln. Why is that? Can somebody help me out?