

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

February 16, 2000 LB 1018

on the advancement of LB 1018, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Members of the Legislature, I read over this bill again last night. It's one of those types of bills where the more you read it, the more problems you see in it. Some amendments that I'm going to offer can be called technical in nature because they are designed to again put the language in the form it should be. I will give you an example and also it will give me a chance to put this into the record. On page 12, in line 9, and it's a subdivision where they're trying to show what all types of categories of persons would be included under the term "manufacturer" or "distributor." So in subdivision (a) they say "a representative of the manufacturer or distributor". Then in subdivision (b) they say again "or representative of the manufacturer or distributor". So why put the identical language in two subdivisions? That could have been a drafting error. But I'm going to strike certain language, I'm going to replace other language, if you agree with the argument that I give. On page 12, in line 9, we just have the naked word "representative", then we say "of the manufacturer or distributor". That introduces a term which need not be put into the law because in the existing law, where they're giving definitions, there is the term "manufacturer representative" and also "distributor representative". So what I would do, and I'm...I've drafted an amendment for that purpose and I'm touching on it now, so in case, in my haste, I did not properly draft it, I would strike the language in subdivision (a) which says "a representative of the manufacturer or distributor", and substitute the language that already exists in the law and simply say "a manufacturer representative or a distributor representative". Then we're tracking the existing law and not introducing new terms. There is another problem that I see based on an exchange I had with the Speaker yesterday, where I expressed concern about some language on page 12, in line 20, where the word "interest" appears. The Speaker said he believes that is designed to say or refer to a legal interest. So what I would like to do is put that modifier in the law, make it clear from the language we use what it is we're talking about. The term "interest" would not necessarily, standing by itself, mean a legal interest. And I would like to change the construction of that sentence. So instead of saying "owns an interest" or