

can look at. So in my estimation, again, the issue is a health issue and ought to be sent to the Health Committee. Now let's be somewhat frank here in terms of why we've had the push in the past and why I believe we have the push today to have the bill go to Judiciary Committee and why it is important besides just policy and principle. The Health Committee has handled the issue in the past and though we did not pass it the first two years, we did pass it the third year. And Senator Dierks is on the committee and was the primary sponsor of the smokeless tobacco bill, LB 48, back a couple of years ago. The committee, because of its interest in health issues, has been more perceptive perhaps to concerns about the health related issues involved in this matter. Judiciary Committee, I haven't really looked at the membership on it and I have no idea whether or not they... what kind of response the bill would have, but I would argue that... well, so my argument is that I think one of the reasons that you're seeing a push to have the bill go to Judiciary is that there would be a more receptive response from that committee than the Health and Human Services Committee. But I would argue that is not a good reason for referencing a bill. However the committee may respond to a bill isn't as important as the focus of the committee, is it the appropriate jurisdiction for the committee and to try and follow along with that philosophy. If we started picking and choosing what committees got bills all the time we would have a difficulty. But let me also grant you that if I were in Senator Baack's shoes or some other sponsor of the bill's shoes, I'd probably rather have it go to another committee than Health and Human Services too, so I don't dismiss that they have some reason and logic for trying to have a go elsewhere, but I think that isn't really the reason that we should reference or not reference a bill. Likewise, I would argue if you look at the worksheet, clearly, the Judiciary Committee has got its hands full. They've got more bills than anybody else and a difficult time in dealing with those issues and it certainly is not a work load problem here. In fact, referencing the bill to Health and Human Services Committee would, I think, make some sense in terms of work load, but again, I don't know if I'd argue that point. I think we would try and set jurisdictions and make some argument about who gets bills and I think the Health and Human Services Committee clearly should receive this bill. I grant you if the bill is rereferenced, to Senator Baack, that the hearing will be early. I've held back scheduling some of the hearings in order to make sure that if we do receive this bill it will receive a hearing in February and will receive a fair hearing and