

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

April 13, 2005      LB 480

true?

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: It would.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, how can...

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: It would mitigate the difficulty in interpretation of what is food preparation and what is not. I think it makes for an ease of interpretation.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But the fact is, the way you define a bar for these purposes, what everybody would recognize as a bar would be excluded. Isn't that true? Let's say a bar sells nothing but liquor. That's all that it sells. It would not be a bar under this definition for the purposes of smoking or nonsmoking, would it?

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: For purposes of this definition, an establishment that sells liquor only, as it stands now--and I stand to be corrected--would be considered a restaurant.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If it sells only liquor?

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now under your definition, because I'm going to let others talk about that, when I say it sells only liquor, I mean it sells no pickle cards, no lottery tickets. That facility that sells only liquor to be consumed on the premises would not be allowed to have smoking, would it?

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: As it stands now, obviously I would be open to an amendment that would...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, no. I'm not talking about amendment. I meant the way you have it written now.

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: The way it's written now, yes. Yes, you're right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'd like to ask Senator Bourne a question