

intent that this would be a major expenditure for those that would need to do something to comply. It amounts to a best effort. If you have...those, as I said before, those that have 15 or more employees are the ones that would be affected, they must develop a smoking policy. An employee can designate their area nonsmoking, which an employee can do now. Fifty percent of the cafeteria, lunch room and lounge space must be nonsmoking. This, in all practical effect, is what it is now. If you're under 1200 square feet, which is the present law, you do not have to have that. You can designate the whole area smoking, if you so desire. So it has no impact under 1,200 square feet and under. Bars and restaurants, in spite of what you've been led to believe, are not affected by this. There is a present policy now, that policy will continue. The only way they would be impacted on this is if they had 15 or more employees, then they would be required to have a smoking policy and to have a defined nonsmoking area. The one thing it does is makes it clear that you cannot penalize nonsmokers who require a nonsmoking work area. This might be an area that is a bone of contention in the law, but, to me, this...a nonsmoker should have rights as well as a smoker, and it should not be an issue as to whether they have a right to exert that influence or to assert their authority in this area. This simply says that they may do so, that they will not be penalized if they do, they will not be ostracized if they do, and, in a lot of ways, I think it ought to make for a more compatible work place, because the employer now may be reluctant to have a definition of a smoking/no smoking area, not sure whether he will have the back of the law behind him. Even though he has many requests for this, they're not sure whether they really should or shouldn't do it, or if they do, will I have a suit. This simply says that they will be, with 15 or more employees, need to have a definition of a smoking policy and should feel comfortable in providing an area. And that, if a nonsmoker does raise the issue, they have every right, just as a smoker has today, to smoke, a nonsmoker would have the right to have a smoke-free work place. Now I've not gone into all of the areas of the passive smoke, in some ways I consider this almost aside of the point, because many have made other issues out of this. But we have a lot of research, especially since 1986, showing the affects of passive smoke on others. And we know that we have a declining amount of smokers in the United States today. It seemed logical to me when I took the bill that if 25, even if 27 percent are smokers, then the other 72 to 75 percent that are nonsmokers ought to be sure that they have a right to some clean air, too. As I said, it's not