

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

January 12, 2000 LB 505

you completely. The statistics are there from other states that an increase of up to 50 cents a pack will have an effective reducing result in limiting and reducing the purchase of cigarettes by young people, and I'm talking about kids that get them under 18. Now we've also heard the argument, and I don't think Senator Engel is here but I wanted to debate him a little bit in good humor, we both live in counties that are out in the edge of the state. Actually, Sidney is only 16 miles from Colorado. I'm not concerned about the borderline bleeding effect at all. Kids don't make long trips to buy cases full of cigarettes. There is going to be some of that. We all know that. That isn't really the point of this argument. The point of this debate is, do we want our children to hear the other side of the story and hear some of the disadvantages of smoking? Smoking is responsible for 87 percent of lung cancer cases, 82 percent of deaths from chronic pulmonary disease, such as emphysema, 21 percent of deaths from heart disease, and 18 percent of deaths from strokes. The life expectancy of people who smoke is decreased by 14 years. Smoking accounts for 10 percent of all infant deaths and 20 to 30 percent of low birth weights in babies. That's what we should be talking about. Our children are entitled to hear the other side of the story and that's what this bill is about and I urge your support of it, and of the amendment.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Matzke. Continue discussion, Senator Redfield.

SENATOR REDFIELD: Thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I don't believe that there is anyone here in the room today that can say that smoking is healthy for you. That debate was settled long ago and every single person in this room knows that tobacco products sell death, death and sickness. We all agree. So what should we be talking about here today? It is not whether tobacco is good or bad. It is not about tax. It is who should pay? Who should pay? Now everyone is saying this is a good idea, we need to educate our children. We need to help people cease their smoking activity to preserve their health, but this isn't the way to pay for it. And I am going to ask you, how then shall we pay for it? Because I had to ask myself a question. No one can accuse me of being protax increase. No one can accuse me of ever being a socialist. And the lobby