

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

April 7, 2005

LB 480

standpoint, this bill is not about consumers, because consumers do have a choice, but workers do not. Now you could say, well, yes, they could go work someplace else, and that's true, but that's also true for the person who works in the manufacturing plant, and government has not taken that position. We have said that there's an obligation on the part of the business owner to provide clean air for the worker to breathe, so I believe that's what this bill is about and that's why I'm going to support this bill. It is about protecting the workers from harm to their health. Senator Thompson also has an amendment to the committee amendment that I want to just address shortly, and that is one part of that I am troubled by. I am more comfortable with the committee amendment as it stands because they are talking about workplaces where the public generally may be present. Senator Thompson would take out that wording and in that list, in the language of the bill, you actually would see that an office would be included, and if you did...by taking out the language you could have an office where you ran your own business that you own and you were the only worker. Because it's an office you would not be able to allow smoking. If you're the only one there, if it's your office, that's your choice. You're the worker. You're also the owner. You're the boss. That I would not be so comfortable with. But I do wholeheartedly support the bill. I'm going to support the committee amendment. This is about a stance government decided long ago--protecting workers. Thank you.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Thank you, Senator Redfield. (Visitors introduced.) Senator Bourne, you are the next speaker.

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you, Madam President. Members, I just want to respond to a couple things, and then I'm going to ask if Senator Thompson will yield. I want to nail down specifically as to what is in her bill. We've heard a lot of public health arguments and policy arguments, but I think we need to know exactly what we're banning and where. But Senator Preister compared this bill to the methamphetamine bill and I fail to see how limiting an input for a drug that has absolutely devastated our state compares to secondhand cigarette smoke. Now, I will acknowledge there's some health ramifications with secondhand cigarette smoke, but I don't think that you can compare a legal