

SPEAKER BARRETT: The motion fails. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: I have nothing further on the bill, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Dierks, on the bill.

SENATOR DIERKS: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, could I consider this a closing? I'd like nothing better than to get this bill voted up or down today. I think we've spent plenty of time on it. We've talked about all the pros and cons. We know all the ifs and ands. There is nothing left that we have to talk about. Anything that I say is repetitive. It just takes our time. The only thing I'd like to remind you of is this bill and it's the way it was introduced and it was passed in committee, and the way it was passed through General File, the way it looks at you right now. This bill does exactly what we asked it to do in the first place, to prevent the gift of smokeless tobacco to the people of this state. That is the only thing we're asking. We're asking that we do this for the following reasons. Number one, smokeless tobacco is an addictive product, it causes addiction of our youth, it causes addiction of our citizens. Number two, it is cancerous, it is carcinogenic, it causes lip and mouth and tongue cancer. We know that. There is no question about that. If we can stop that from happening to one or two people in our state a year, we've done them a favor with the passage of this bill. Number three, it causes dental caries which is a relatively side effect, but it does do that. We need to consider all the pros about this legislation. There really is nothing about it that you can find that should be distasteful, pardon the pun. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Discussion on the advancement of the bill, Senator Bernard-Stevens followed by Senators Moore, Dierks and Schmit.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I don't intend to take the body very much longer. Philosophically, I have no problems with what Senator Dierks is trying to do. In fact, it is very laudable and it is a very good attempt of trying to do something that is good. Philosophically, however, the approach is bad policy and I don't know if the body is...sometimes we get in the mood to pass something to get it moving that we'll go ahead and vote to get it out of the way