

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

January 11, 2000 LB 505

other tobacco use increase. However, it's different in that it identifies specifically the kind of prevention control enforcement and cessation programs that would be funded, so we would very clearly know where the money would go for that 30 cents in a clearer form than we did in the amendment that we had before, as well as a couple of other changes in some numbers that have to be changed to make the bill make sense at this time. Before I get to that amendment, which I think will be coming up at the end of this speech probably, I'd like to identify two basic themes. Number one, price influences consumption and it influences with kids more than anybody else. If the taxes go up, the prices go up. If the prices go up, the consumption starts going down. That is not a claim. That is not a hope. That is not a wish. That is a fact provable in at least six other states which I will recite for you it may seem endlessly by the time we get done to the...make a final vote, but in fact there is a body of evidence so clear as to be indisputable and that body of evidence will establish that, as the price goes up, the consumption goes down, and is particularly the case for kids. So theme number one: if you want particularly to affect youth consumption taxes is one way to effectively do that and the record is too clear to dispute. Secondly, that there are effective, well-organized plans for cessation and prevention which also have a record of success and now the amendment that I'm about to offer funds that exact program from the Center of Disease Control model programs that have been used throughout the country, model programs that have a history of success. So theme number two: the money that we're going to raise from LB 505 is going to go right back into health and smoking-related concerns with services aimed at kids, aimed at adults, aimed at preventing those who do not now smoke and getting those who do now smoke to stop if at all possible. Those are the two themes that will justify why we would pass LB 505 in the face of a lobbying blitz and, frankly, a number of angry smoker constituents--people that would rather not have the taxes on this addictive substance raised. I understand perfectly. If I have to choose between evils, between harms, between injuries, I choose the harm of raising the tax on a population that doesn't want to pay it and will have a memory and will be angry with me and us, in order to avoid a far greater damage or harm, the kind of harm we were sent here to protect ourselves against, and that is the premature death of