

April 16, 1981

LB 506

Wesleyan, right on down the line. In addition, there is some research that is being done on the industry basis. We have grants being made by the Swanson Nutritional Center in Omaha throughout the United States, throughout the United States for various kinds of food research but some of that includes cancer research. I think it is wrong to narrow...to so narrow the grant making possibilities that are under this amendment to two institutions, to people working at the University of Nebraska or Creighton. Secondly, one of the things that I thought was very good about LB 506 was the fact that some of the dollars could be used not just for research but also for community education programs, community information programs. To a large extent, you know, a lot of the cancers that people sustain are products in some respects...some of the harm that is done by the cancer is a product of their failure to take the necessary steps to alleviate or to promote early detection. Cervical cancer in women, for example, is a condition that can be corrected early on, but for a woman to detect cervical cancer, she needs to appear regularly before a physician for a Pap smear. Now that kind of information is information that needs to be imparted regularly in Nebraska so that women do take those steps to make certain that they are having the Pap smear and so cervical cancer is detected early, so the treating physician can take the appropriate steps and 506 as originally drafted without the Warner amendment would have allowed some dollars to be used by private organizations to providing exactly that kind of information, that is for the detection of cancer and for the prevention of cancer. In addition, one of the things we may very well note is that there are certain parts of our state where there truly are hot spots for cancer. In fact, I think that Senator Maresh has got some areas where there is a fairly high incidence of colon cancer. Now again, since we know those statistical facts, there is no reason why we cannot use information to go out into the communities in those areas and suggest to people that they do go to physicians for examinations and those kinds of examinations can be more likely to detect cancer at a much earlier stage where at that time it is much more treatable without such devastating effects on the body. So I oppose the Warner amendment for the two reasons that it too narrowly, it too narrowly focuses our money into two institutions and for one purpose and one purpose only and that is research. The original bill allowed the money, the same amount of dollars, to be spread over more causes and to more places and for more purposes, all dealing with cancer.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Cullan, do you want to speak to the bill? We are on the Warner amendment. Do you wish to speak to it? Senator Warner, do you want to close on your amendment?