

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

January 12, 2000 LB 505

paying a lot of money to repair what is done as a result of the use of tobacco. But then on the other hand, it's very difficult to stand up and vote for more taxes. I mean, I think it's just against our nature to want to tax an additional amount of money to people for the use of this particular product. But I was listening to Senator Landis when he opened and there were two points that he was saying were at issue. The first is that by this bill it will reduce the amount of consumption, and the second part of the bill was that it would have an educational factor and tend to reduce consumption by getting particularly the younger people educated. I don't think we can do much about those who are already hooked on tobacco. I think we have to probably be looking at those who haven't yet achieved that level of being addicted. So anyway, those are the two issues. Last year I voted against this because I did not feel that issue number two was addressed at all by the previous bill. It did not have any educational factor. It was simply a punitive tax with the monies to go into the state treasury. I thought that there should be some comprehensive program. Now I'm still a bit concerned about this because I say, yes, this will add additional funds then that can be used for this purpose of perhaps keeping people from becoming addicted, but we do already have the money from the tobacco settlement that certainly could have been used or could be used for that purpose. So I come right back to the initial issue--will this reduce consumption? There are arguments that it won't, that people will just go across the border and things like that. I think the best evidence of the fact that it will reduce consumption is the level of interest that the tobacco companies have in seeing that this does not pass. So I think that is the proof of the fact that there is...there is evidence of the fact that it will reduce the consumption. And I just think that if I boiled it right down, why am I interested in this bill, and I think that there are too many people now that are addicted to this and that we, as the state of Nebraska, end up picking up the tab for many people who are unable to afford the medical treatment that's going to result from the things that we know at this point that they're going to incur. So it's very hard not to vote for this if we think that there's any way that, number one, we can reduce some of the addiction to tobacco and, secondly, that perhaps we can lessen the burden on the taxpayers of the state of Nebraska by getting fewer people who receive these ailments resulting