

is very clear as to what it allows and what it does not allow. Secondly, I would think the question of, is there a legitimate public purpose, does the Legislature have a legitimate legislative purpose in passing this statute? In this case the Legis...the Legislatures, state governments are empowered with the ability to enact legislation that protects the public health. Does restricting the use of cigarette vending machines protect the public health? Well, it may or it may not. Why did the Legislature say that it did? Well, we established legislative findings that there is a connection between our power to protect the public health and the use of cigarettes by minors, the ability of minors to acquire cigarettes easily. And if we can then restrict the ability of minors to acquire cigarettes more easily, we have furthered the legitimate public purpose of...of protecting the health of the public. So, the legislative findings that there is a connection between smoking tobacco and that...and poor health, and that young people need to be protected from the use of tobacco, and that banning the use of cigarette machines in areas open to the general public, even though the bill doesn't do that anymore, is a...is a legitimate purpose, and it's probably necessary to have legislative findings in this bill. But my concern is still there, that when we state those, those ought to be stated in language that is appropriate statutory language and not statements of opinion. I'm concerned in other cases, I can recall a bill, a few years ago, it was brought by a very well-meaning state senator who had a concern about the manner in which intercollegiate athletics was conducted in Nebraska, and it was one which would provide for a stipend for payment of football players. I forget who the senator was that introduced that. I just cannot...cannot...I think he's introduced other legislation in that area. And I agreed with the...I agreed with what the bill was to do, it was to...to pay a stipend. However, the first three pages of the bill were, in essence, a brief, a legal brief stating the cause as to why the NCAA was...was a group of reprobates who ought not to be allowed to continue in doing what they were doing. And I was concerned of putting that statutory, that intent language, basically a political argument into statute might cause us problems down the road. So I was feeling like that was going...going way too far in the sort of language that goes into the statutes. This isn't as bad. I think the point that people have made is what I've raised is a legitimate issue that maybe ought to guide the Legislature in future bill drafting, but that this is not, by far,...