

of individuals, specifically beer wholesalers, to have their cake and eat it too, have their cake and eat it too, have their cake and eat it four times. It is the type of thing that I would think, you know, the chamber of commerce would come in kicking and screaming that it is protectionist legislation and that we should not be endorsing this kind of thing. And we talked about other types of franchise operations. Look at the committee statement. The only people that are interested in this legislation are the beer wholesalers. They are the only people that testified for the measure. It is serious business on their part because it's a big bill and it just about squeaked through and I guess at this point in time I'm going to rein it in and I don't feel bad at all about spending a little time discussing priority legislation that is of this magnitude. With that, Mr. President, I would urge the adoption of the kill motion.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. You've heard the closing. The question is, shall LB 371 be indefinitely postponed? Those in favor of that motion vote aye, opposed vote nay. Have you all voted? Record, please.

CLERK: 1 aye, 23 nays, Mr. President, on the motion to indefinitely postpone.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Motion fails. Next motion, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Hall would move to amend. Senator, I have your amendment, amendment numbered number one. (See FA82 on page 1261 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Mr. President and members, this is basically a technical amendment. If you would open the bill to page 11, it strikes the "the" on line 14 through "situated" on line 15. It would strike this language. The similarly situated on page 14, excuse me, on page 11, line 14 it strikes the "the" on line 14 through "situated" on line 15. So it strikes this language. It strikes "the similarly situated". And on page...this is basically a technical amendment. I think that there was just a drafting error in the bill and there is no substantive issue here at all. On page 23 then also, it strikes the...on line 13,