

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

April 5, 2002 LB 1085

because there's 30 votes that you're going to come up with. But anyway, I'm going to support this amendment today, and get it back on again, and see where we go from there. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Jones. Senator Synowiecki, on the Jensen amendment.

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: Thank you, Senator Cudaback, members. I can't support a regressive tax on the poor, those that are unfortunately addicted to this legal substance. And it's just a philosophical position of mine that this disproportionately affects the poor. Some statistics here that I have, as far as the regressive taxation of cigarettes; households with incomes of less than \$30,000 make up about half of all tobacco purchases, 47 percent of purchases; households with incomes of less than \$30,000. Households with incomes of \$30,000-\$50,000 make 30 percent of all tobacco purchases. Households with incomes over \$50,000 make only 23 percent of tobacco purchases. There's evidence that suggest that raising tobacco taxes does not get the intended results by the proponents. After New York, California, and Michigan increased cigarette taxes beginning in 1988, each reported a substantial reduction in cigarette sales, by 31 percent, 28 percent, and 30 percent respectively. Yet, the evidence suggests that smoking did not decrease in these states, even going up slightly in Michigan as residents started buying their favorite brands out of state. In 1995, one year after Michigan raised its cigarette tax, low tax states with a one...within a one-day drive saw an increase in their cigarette sales, ranging from 4.5 percent to 12 percent. Since California raised its cigarette tax in 1988, black market sales have risen to an estimated 17.2 percent to 23 percent of cigarettes sold. I just don't think it's going to get the intended result as far as the health issues. I think the...you're well-intentioned on what you're doing, but it just doesn't get the end result. If you're a wealthy person making \$180,000 a year, and you so happen to smoke, this isn't going to affect you, you'll pay the 30 cents easily, won't even affect your pocketbook. But if you're poor, and you're unfortunately addicted, this...this implements a...an economic embargo on the poor. It's a government-knows-best approach to people that have...don't have the means to pay this tax; a government-knows-best approach.