

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

April 22, 2003 LB 759

yes, I voted for deep cuts. I will go to the university and say, yes, I voted for deep cuts. But there's three things...there's things that people can call me and I can live with it. They can call me stupid. I can deal with that. They can call me narrow-minded and provincial. I can deal with that. Senator Landis has already called me a couple of those things, in private, of course. What I don't want people to call me is a hypocrite. When they look in my face...and again, we go back to the campaign trail, 5,500 doors. When I look in their face and give them what I really believe is the answer to the question, no matter what the budget deficit or budget shortfall was, what I feel like the answer to the question was, and now I turn around and say, let's raise your taxes; don't worry about what I said, let's just raise them across the board; don't worry about what I said. Hypocrite. I could have the shortest career of any politician on the face of the earth. I can live with that. I think my wife can live with that and my four kids can live with that, because they'll still call me dad. But there's 35... (laugh) there's 35,000 people in my district that can't live with that, because I really believed in what I was trying to sell. This looks like what I was trying to sell. And if I've belabored this point, I apologize. But I will return my time to the Chair if I've got any left, or yield it to Senator Quandahl, if he chooses.

SPEAKER BROMM: You have one minute. Senator Quandahl, do you wish to have that?

SENATOR QUANDAHL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Senator Friend, for the time. I, too...I don't wish to belabor this, because I know this basically has been a pretty long day of our first serious discussions on the budget. And so not wishing to belabor the issue too much longer, I'd just say that this particular amendment that's before you...I know it's not an easy thing for any of us to contemplate, but it really does boil down to a fairly simple concept, and that's to eliminate the statutory earmarks that are currently in place for our cigarette tax revenue. All of the revenues from cigarette tax, if an amendment such as this is adopted by the body, would go into our General Funds, would go into the General Fund, and would be available then to actually address some of the fiscal