

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Mr. President, members, I co-signed this motion with Senator Johnson. I agreed with Senator Johnson 100 percent that I would support the bill without the earmarking and when we weren't able to return the bill and take off that earmarking I felt, as Senator Johnson did, that we ought to kill the bill. To kill the bill was to send a message to those individuals who are supporting the earmarking provisions of the bill, to tell them that we did not want that part of the bill. I think that message, hopefully, has been heard by those individuals, however, it hasn't changed their mind that they're still going to want to continue to have the earmarking provisions of the bill, but I will continue to oppose that. Senator Sieck talked about Vard Johnson's change of heart. I know I've had a change of heart as well in terms of killing the bill and Senator Johnson has as well, but I don't think either of us have changed our minds and our feelings in our heart that we should not have the earmarking provisions of this bill. It's a mistake at this time with a tight budget to talk about the provisions being earmarked as they are suggested in this legislation and I'll continue to fight that, but the bill itself in terms of meeting the need on that cigarette tax potential revenue, I think it would be a mistake not to proceed with that. As you probably know, a number of states have already taken action. I think maybe even half of them have already got legislation on the books to take advantage of that cigarette tax decrease if it occurs. We would be pretty foolish not to do the same, so I would ask your support for revising the bill and bringing it back, but I would also suggest that this is again an indication that I'm not going to change my mind on the earmarking.

PRESIDENT: Senator Labeledz.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in opposition to the motion to revive LB 190 and I understand that in the House there are nine different bills at the very moment to raise, even raise the cigarette tax or to keep it at the same amount and it involves the signatures of 80 different members of the House. There is a possible, and I, for one, say no chance whatsoever that we will be able to obtain or take advantage of that eight cents a pack tax that would be eliminated as of October 1st. If there is that many senators in the House that are interested in raising