PRESIDENT: Senator Scott Moore, we're looking for you. Senator Goodrich, would you record your presence, please. Thank you.

CLERK: Senator Rogers voting yes.

PRESIDENT: Record, Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays on adoption of the committee amendments, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: The committee amendments are adopted. Senator Wehrbein, would you like your opening statement, please.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members.

PRESIDENT: The call is raised.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Thank you. Just to start out with, I know many of you wonder why I'm particular in carrying this bill. And I ought to probably start out by saying that this is called the Nebraska Clean Indoor Air Act and is no way intended to be anti-smoking. I understand it's interpreted to be that way. It's not interpreted to be anti-business, and there are those that are interpreting it that way. But this bill does nothing more than to carry on from the place that we're at now in our present regulations in law. It simply adds to it some penalties for failure to enforce these laws, if it is done. In a lot of ways, it can be seen as many to be pro-business, because it more clearly defines the rights of smokers and nonsmokers alike. I've passed around to you a list of a lot of the organizations that are in support of this because, in the real world today, in the business world today there are many that would prefer a smoking policy, and there are many that would prefer a no smoking policy. This simply is going to put in the law what defines that, where that line starts, in this case 15 or more employees you must have a policy. If you're under 15 you do not need to define smoking and no smoking. You may have it all smoking, if you so desire. If you're over 15, you will need to define a smoking/no smoking area, just as it is today, it's just simply that there is no enforcement in the laws today. Now it's also intended to be quite modest. It's much more modest or moderate than it's been in the past. If you read down the outline of the bill, it says that there is no structural changes, costing any money or necessary for compliance. Now I admit that this might be open for conjecture, but it's not the