April 10, 1981

LB 483

CLERK: (Read roll call vote as found on pages 1396-1397 of the Legislative Journal.) 17 ayes, 26 nays, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Motion lost.

CLERK: Mr. President, I now have a motion from Senator Labedz to return the bill to Select File for a specific amendment and the amendment is on page 1362. Mr. President.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Are we on the correct amendment now? There was one previous to that that was withdrawn. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I am very sorry that I have to bring LB 483 back from Final Reading but as you all know we did have a hearing on Monday and this bill was discussed at length and there was several questions asked of the representative of the Liquor Commission and the amendment that is going to be discussed at this moment does not make any other changes other than correcting the language, very small changes, changing the wording but the concept of the original amendment that I put on 483 is still there. It does not change anything but puts the amendment in correct form and I urge you to vote for the amendment or bring the bill back from Final Reading so we can adopt the amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Newell, do you wish to speak to the Labedz amendment?

SENATOR NEWELL: Are there any other lights?

SPEAKER MARVEL: There are three lights. Senator Hefner,

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President, colleagues, I rise to support this amendment. We did have a hearing on LB 555 the other night. It was a very informative meeting. We asked the executive director of the Liquor Control Commission to appear for informational purposes only, which he did, and he gave us a few ideas that we could use if we wanted to to explain what the term generic means and of course we have included that now on line 3 and this amendment is on page 1362 if you want to follow along with me. This is an amendment to LB 483 and it also, besides spelling out what generic label means, it also spells out what private label means and I think this is very good because it makes it perfectly clear what our intent is here. On line 17 it also describes what are not violations and I don't think Senator Labedz mentioned it but we have added the emergency clause in this amendment. I felt that we should have passed some form of legislation last year already because this is when the Attorney General brought the charge against this certain company and it was brought up at the hearing. Well the company did not want special legislation.

3232