

the elevator because there are people who are superstitious. Senator Moore is not superstitious, but even if he were, he wouldn't have much choice about offering this amendment because Senator John is in full cry. He has booted, spurred and mounted and riding Senator Scott Moore. But Senator Scott Moore is young, strong, vibrant. Look at those shoulders. Look at power, power incarnate, waiting to be ridden and John DeCamp is doing that job. Nevertheless, this is a good amendment that Senator Moore offered. I don't play cards, but I've heard the expression of overplaying your hand. Maybe that is what the tobacco industry is doing with this amendment. Nevertheless, I think it should be taken seriously and I am going to vote in favor of it. I do see nicotine as a drug. All forms of tobacco can produce addiction and there are many people addicted to tobacco. There are thousands of people who die annually from tobacco caused and related diseases, so I will support this amendment and I will also support the bill. I hope there are enough voters to put this amendment on the bill and then pass the bill.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Dierks.

SENATOR DIERKS: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members of the body, I'm glad that we've gotten down to the nitty-gritty of the amendments that Senator Moore has. My feelings about the amendment that he offers are...well, they're mixed. I appreciate what he is trying to do and I really don't have that many problems with it except I think we'd have difficulty getting that amendment passed, getting the bill passed with that amendment. I'd like to give the rest of my time to Senator Wesely.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members, I just wanted to rise and let you know, on this amendment there was no reference to it in the public hearing. The Health and Human Services Committee did hear LB 48. I don't feel at this time with the substance of the issue that we ought to proceed on it, that it deserves separate attention. It is similar in scope, but at the same time, I don't think we gave adequate notice for people to be involved in the process, and so I would oppose the amendment with the understanding that that issue can come back and we could have a hearing and we can look at the issue in follow-up to LB 48. But at this time I feel it's inappropriate