

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

March 30, 2006 LB 454

different than rural Nebraska. But it's important to note the fact that there is not the fear of firearms across Nebraska, as Senator Schimek...at least I perceive to be portraying across rural Nebraska. That is my concern. And certainly Nebraska is a powers granted state, so local entities cannot do something that the law at the state level is silent on or does not expressly forbid or allow. It is assumed to be forbidden unless it is expressly mentioned in state statute. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Smith. Senator Combs.

SENATOR COMBS: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I want to make it clear that people are carrying concealed right now. I asked the Crime Commission for some data that they compiled and then were getting it...were taking a second look at it again, but the kinds of violations as a group with weapons per year was about 1,000, and we have 28-1202 on the books now. The carriers under 28-1202 even asked for an amendment to decrease the penalty from a first-degree misdemeanor to a fourth-degree misdemeanor, and these are people who do not want to take the training and they don't want to be fingerprinted. They still have the rights under 28-1202 to do that. They are carrying right now. If a city has not had a problem with these people that are lawful, legal, law-abiding citizens carrying, then with the further public safety insurance of these people having training and a criminal background check, these 28...Section 28-1202 of the law, these people that are carrying under the affirmative defense are not required to have any training. That is a public safety loophole, but we left it alone. We left those people. We did not bother that. That's existing statute, and we have people carrying right now. So there has not been a need, as Senator Smith has said, for city legislation. If they want to and they see the need, then they will have to justify that need and they will act accordingly. That's not what I'm talking about with my bill today. My bill, the intention is that it's preemptive. I'm not an attorney and I don't have the answer to that question. And I don't think that it's a question that must be answered today, and it's one that cannot be answered today. It's also a condition that if it's added to the bill and this bill is taken off of Final