

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

March 9, 2004 LB 906

under the Cosmetology Act, so that we don't add another bureaucracy. They do have people that go...that will be assigned to do the inspecting of these facilities, so...and then there will be a charge for the fees for the practitioner license and the facility license, and it will be self-supporting in the fact that the fees will generate the monies needed to do the inspection.

SENATOR LOUDEN: True.

SENATOR STUHR: So...

SENATOR LOUDEN: But nonetheless, that's the reason you have a fiscal note of \$26,000 or whatever it is.

SENATOR STUHR: Yes.

SENATOR LOUDEN: There's going to have to be more people hired for that, and at the present time, like in the Ag Department and them, they're passing legislation, we did the other day, for the dairy products and the bee business so that they don't have as many inspectors, because they can't afford the ones they have. Now are we going to put a...put a load on the cosmetology so that those, the cosmetology sector, won't be inspected as properly as what we had? I would like to see...I question whether we really need to do this or if we can let it be worked out by cities and by counties rather than a one size fits all. I think...I don't, at the present time, I don't feel that I can probably support this bill, because I think there's other ways of doing it. And any time I have left I'll return to Senator Stuhr.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Stuhr.

SENATOR STUHR: Okay, thank you, Senator Louden. We have had those discussions with the Health and Human Services Department and I believe that...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR STUHR: ...their intent is to help to contract with