

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

May 7, 2003

LB 283

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And since it makes a difference to me, I have to address it and deal with it. I do not think the Legislature should be beholden to the liquor establishment. So I intend to try to get this bill in the form I believe it should be in. If you do not want this amendment because you think it would raise the liquor tax higher than where you think it should be, maybe we should find some place in between what the bill is offering and what my amendment is offering. But I certainly would not agree to support this bill in its present form. And I would hope that enough of my colleagues feel the same way. If this bill is not, for some reason, moved along, the only game in town on this issue becomes Senator Brashear's bill.

SPEAKER BROMM: Time. Thank you, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BROMM: (Visitors introduced.) Senator Jensen.

SENATOR JENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature. I stand in support of Senator Chambers' amendment. And for those who think that this is going to break those individuals who do use alcoholic beverages, we just ran a quick chart. And for a can of beer, it's about two cents; again, less than what we're taxing one, one cigarette for. A six-pack of beer is 12 cents. A case of beer, 50 cents. That's what the additional tax would be. Certainly, all of it going to the General Fund. I think it's a worthwhile endeavor to do this. When you look at all the cost that is coming out of the General Fund in support of those individuals who are behind bars, who are...where we have families that are being destroyed, where we have divorces, I think this is only right that we would do this. It's not enough to make anyone cross the bridge to buy a case of beer; 50 cents. If you drank a case of beer every day for a year, you would pay \$188.89 extra. So if someone says that this is far too much, yes, it might be higher than our surrounding states. I don't know what this would do up at Whiteclay, if it had (laugh) any change up there whatsoever. Probably not. But anyway, the amount is still small. And so I just stand in support of Senator Chambers' amendment. I'll return the rest of my time back to the Chair, unless Senator Chambers, would you