

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

March 14, 2005      LB 563

taxes on products generally, you know, that's a discussion we ought to have, and if that would limit consumption I think that would be fine. But I don't believe this will raise a penny. I think it will lower the amount of availability and that it will change formulations and so that the products that come here will come with a 100 percent distilled content...I mean a brewed content instead of distilled, and that we won't have as many products here, and that may be what we want to do as a state. But I don't think we ought to think that we're going to increase revenues or that we're going to decrease consumption or that we're going to not have products available for people. You know, we abuse muscatel and MD 20/20 and the hot...here in this state we have fortified beers that are marketed to people that shouldn't be drinking this inexpensive product. But we have that. We need to work on making sure that we give education, that we have as much prevention process as possible, but I don't know if we can stand in the way of the market. The market is going to make these decisions. And I oppose changing this. I think we ought to go with the federal requirement the same...I mean, not requirement, but the federal definition. I would have probably set it at a lower level, but the feds did it and so it's going to be all across the country at 49 percent. I would have probably put it at a lower level, but that's what the industry is going to make, unless they make it for targeted markets. And we are not a very big market, so most likely the availability will be diminished here for consumers. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Connealy. Senator Smith, on the FA31.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I'm trying to sort through all of the arguments here. I hear Senator Jensen's arguments, I hear Senator Chambers' arguments, and other members as well, and I think it's important to note that things get a little dicey when we attempt to use tax policy to effect a social outcome, which I hear Senator Jensen saying. I think it's very appropriate that we use tax policy to attempt to achieve an economic outcome, but any time we've tried to mix those two...and I know that it's done. I think that our tax policy in regards to tobacco is pretty convoluted. If the