

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

January 12, 2000 LB 505

not, and I think that Senator Redfield has very well pointed out that, in terms of the kind of tax it is, it is certainly as focused a response as you can get. I wanted to say that the suggestions that have been made today, one alternative that was suggested was education, and the other alternative that's been suggested is enforcing real penalties. And I would suggest to you that education alone is not enough, and that enforcing penalties, actually enforcing penalties against thousands of youth every year is messy, expensive, and probably not acceptable to our society, not if we can get the job done in another way. Now this bill, I think it should be pointed out, does not neglect education. It does not say that education is not a tool that we should be using. In fact, it is the second major reason for the bill, I believe, to fund education, the government tool of education. If you turn to page 6 of your amendment, you will see that it talks about community programs to reduce tobacco use; 19 percent of the money collected is going to the different communities for programs, that's education. School programs, 12 percent of the money, that's education. Statewide programs, 5 percent, that's education. Counter marketing, 19 percent, that's education. Cessation programs, that's probably partially education. So the nice thing about this bill is that it's not compromising our purpose to any significant extent. Most of this money is going to education, and what's not is going, basically, to research in a highly related area, cancer. So it does not neglect education. I think Senator Tyson and Senator Baker make good points. Border bleeding is something that we have to keep an eye on, but we don't know what the effect of this bill will be until we try it. It is a measured experiment. I think everybody would have to recognize that but, personally, I doubt if this level of increase will result in significant border bleeding, especially because I believe that what we are doing here today, as it has in several states already, will creep across the nation and will, notwithstanding lobbies in Kansas and Iowa, eventually be in effect in Kansas and Iowa. And once that's the case, then border bleeding becomes a nonevent. So perhaps we should do it and watch the situation. Isn't that what probably makes sense? So, with those short points, I would, again, recommend the measure to you. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator