

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

February 17, 2000 LB 505, 1436

against the advancement of the bill. Number one, it's too little. It isn't enough. It's not realistic and it doesn't have the sense of packaged design that the Center for Disease Control tells us is necessary. The Florida piece, which was successful, and I agree with Senator Redfield that it was, was also part of a Center for Disease Control program. It was not a stand-alone program. Its success may well have been influenced by the fact that it was part of a broader program. This is too little. Secondly, I do think it's from the wrong source, given where we are, but that's a dispute for all of us to take with us when we decide on the future of this. I wish, in fact, we had a chance to dispute where the money should come from. And, lastly, I know legislatures, I've been here a long time, and I think one of the reasons that you take a fight over where the money comes from and this bill and you put them together and the Legislature will quite easily declare victory on youth smoking and walk away, and this would become a sop, not because it's intended to be but because the way legislatures work. They have too much on their plate. They move on. (Laugh) That's right. Don't get within an arm's length, mister. You are at risk from my rhetorical splendor here. I just judo chopped Curt, as he tried to sit down. (Laughter) What we do is we take the latest issue of the day and then, if we do some action, we move on and declare victory. And if I was an anti-LB 505 proponent out there, I would say the Legislature's done; we did LB 1436. Whether Senator Bohlke was here or not, as she will not be next year, to describe her intent or anybody else's intent, it will be used that way. It will ultimately come down to, we've made peace with youth smoking, and this simply isn't enough. It's not a comprehensive program. It is missing vital elements. Whether or not it should be funded from a different source is another thing. But this amount at this time, with no other thinking, is symbolic but not a realistic stab at the problem. It has a value. It takes a step in the right way, but it is a step small enough that the fact that this step will be used against proponents who want to take a bigger step in the future makes it... makes us analyze how big the step is, and the step is modest. The step is too modest and, for that reason, if we can't do more than this, I don't want to do this, because I don't want to have this issue be declared over, and that's what's going to happen politically. Whether or not the proponents, at the moment, on this bill, Senator Bohlke or not,