

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

February 24, 2000 LB 659

analysis have I been so confused, but I was kind of reading the amendment and then I was also reading the bill itself or the Enrollment and Review...or the AM7190, and I don't think the amendment is necessary. I think the bill already addresses both of the concerns in the amendment. The amendment, the first part of it, on lines 1 through 4, says, "no pickle card operator shall be obligated to sell individual pickle cards exclusively on behalf of any one licensed organization to the exclusion of all others". If you read the bill on page 16, starting in line 3, subsection (7), it says, "A pickle card operator may sell individual pickle cards on behalf of more than one licensed organization." So it already says that they can do this, so I don't really understand why we need the first part of the amendment. The second part of the amendment says: and such equipment shall not be purchased, leased, or rented if the purchase, lease, or rental is based upon an obligation requiring such operator to sell only individual pickle cards on behalf of such licensed organization. Well, if you look on page 17 of the amendment, subsection (4), it says, "No distributor shall offer or agree to offer anything of value to any person in exchange for an agreement or commitment by such person to exclusively sell pickle cards sold by such distributor." So, unless I'm misreading this, it seems like what the amendment is trying to do is already addressed in the statute. I really don't see why we need the amendment and I don't intend to support either the amendment or Senator Chambers' amendment to the amendment. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Bourne. Senator Chambers, on the Quandahl amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I think Senator Bourne has brought some very worthwhile information to us, and I pointed out that my amendment that I'm offering was like scraping barnacles off a ship. It was to remove superfluous language from Senator Quandahl's amendment, but with what Senator Bourne has pointed out, that it's already in the existing law, it would probably be the wiser course for the Legislature not to introduce something into the law that brings about confusion. Under the amendment, it prevents people from entering into an arrangement that they voluntarily would enter into. No coercion. They agree to do it. Under this