

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

May 6, 2003

LB 283

However, with respect to picking percentages, picking a standard or a benchmark, we are clearly at the high end of a reasonable benchmark of our peers. That, I think, is a relevant factor. You may set this where you wish. But it seems to me that we've done...exercised, actually, some care in seeing to it that we are at the high end of the scale, but not precipitously high compared to others. We do have people that will travel. They will buy. They will then be traveling and buying alcohol to do so. I think that's an invitation for danger right there. And when we do so, it doesn't affect consumption; it simply affects where it's purchased. In the end, I think you need to be against the grid of those that surround us. And in that grid, we are at the very high end of the scale. It could be higher. But we have not underjudged or underestimated or are a piker, by any means, compared to anybody else. And the difference between us and many of the states that surround us is significant on a percentage basis. I advise you to look through this form. I think you'll see that the Revenue Committee has placed us at the very high end of the rung, with significant steps between where we are and the states that surround us. Thank you.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Connealy.

SENATOR CONNEALY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. I appreciate what Senator Landis said. I agree with that. I think that the Revenue Committee has tried to be moderate here. The best tax, like we all know, is the tax that we don't pay. And even though I do have a drink every once in a while, I'm not going to pay much of this tax. So it ought to be a tax that I'd like. But I think that what we do, and when we're raising revenues, is we have to be moderate, we have to be across-the-board in different areas, so that we don't get out-of-sync. And that's a lot of what Senator Landis talked about. We heard in Revenue Committee how this really is a tax that affects just a certain amount of people. It probably supports Senator Jensen's amendment coming down the line. But we did have a handout on one of the bills that said that 60 percent of the alcohol was consumed by just 7 percent of the population. Those people consume an awful lot of alcohol. It's going to tax them a lot. It would support more treatment. I'm not going to be supporting that. I'm not going to be supporting