

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

May 27, 2003

LB 572

people. So I just rise to...the money is going out of state. It's not a company in Nebraska. It's going to I think Utah or someplace like that. So it's not the right thing to do. We've raised the cigarette tax. We have it permanently in place and it just...we're not going to...I think it's the wrong, wrong thing to do. We have lots of money we collect from the cigarette people and we should use that. If this is such a great program they should get their oar into that particular pot. Thank you.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Hartnett. Senator Bourne.

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. This is the same amendment, I guess, that we discussed the other night and rejected. I have no trouble with the smoking cessation program and it's probably a good thing, but, again, how can we justify increasing taxes even further, another 3 cents, even though arguably this is a good program, how can we justify increasing taxes another 3 cents on each pack of cigarettes? We talked about this extensively on General File and it was rejected, and Senator Schimek mentioned there were several people that were not here, and I appreciate that. But I don't know, it seems to me enough is enough. I mean, I don't know what comes out of the LB 672 money, how much that is, but as I understand it, it's tens, if not hundreds, of millions of dollars. And while Senator Chambers, I heard him on General File and he was very upset that there was no money going towards cessation, and he's not wrong, but it shouldn't come from a tax increase to do it. It should come from that LB 672 money. And Senator Jensen and Senator Byars, after the debate on the previous round when this amendment was rejected, I had asked them is there any way that we can get money out of this fund to do this, and they both said every penny is allocated or spoken for. Well, if that's the case, maybe we should change the allocation. You know, I don't know who gets what out of there. I know there are some very deserving and worthwhile programs, but so is this one. But how can you justify an additional tax after we've raised taxes already this year? I don't see it. In my mind, this is kind of like the straw that broke the camel's back, I think. This...enough is enough. While this might be a good program, I think we need to look at the LB 672 fund to fund this program