

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Jacklyn Smith, please. (Gavel.)

SENATOR SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the body support me in returning LB 154 for a specific amendment. The amendment would basically...the purpose of the amendment is to clarify the section of the bill which would be page 23, on line 4, after the word "purchase" to insert the words "in the aggregate". And then reading on, more than \$300 of alcoholic liquor is allowed under this section and then eliminating the words "from other licensed retailers". And the purpose for the amendment is that we wanted to make sure...there was some concern that this language was not specifically clear about containing the amount of money that could be spent and the opportunity for retailer to retailer sales to be limited only to an aggregate of \$300 a year for all retailer to retailer sales for one retailer. So that's the reason. If anyone has any questions, I will be happy to discuss the amendment with them.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Hall, please.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President, and members, I rise in support of the...I guess, the content of the amendment but in opposition to it on principle because the amendment that I offered to LB 154 was an amendment that was not one that I drafted. It was one that the wholesalers drafted. It was their amendment. It was their language and what happened was some distiller's attorney in Tennessee, I guess, or someplace, decided that this language was not strict enough and the implication is there that possibly it was my intention to circumvent the intent that I offered and that there is reams of legislative evidence to guarantee that it was clearly just an understanding that it was going to be \$300 on an annual basis and that was it, not \$300 from every retailer out there. And I would urge the body to just take a look at page 23 and the sections that Senator Smith alluded to and the change that is being made here because if you read the bill, I clearly don't think there is any need to return the bill and make this change because any sophomore in high school could read that and understand exactly what the language says and I think the intent is clearly spelled out, both in committee hearings here on the floor when we debated it and when the amendment was adopted. This was an amendment that was brought by the wholesalers themselves. We agreed to it. There was...the agreement was for \$500. It was amended on the floor by the body to 300, which was fine. And now they're coming back because of some individuals