I talked about smoking and booze, they are taxed to raise revenue partly but also act as a disincentive to not do something which we have decided is a societal ill. Sugary drinks will end up costing the NHS billions? Drinkers and smokers are used as a cash cow by the government because they take far more in tax from those people than is spent on tackling smoking and drinking related illnesses. You are right to say that the sugar tax would be regressive. It would hit the poorest hardest and would not actually work. We saw in Denmark a few years ago that they tried a flat tax but they had to scrap it because it was having no impact. 80% of people didn't change their consumption habits. What you should have is a healthy balanced diet. Absolutely the government should be looking at advertising, and educating people and that is what
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the campaign is clearly trying to do about good, healthy eating habits. I knew tax certainly wouldn't be the answer. -- a new tax. Guests cite evidence from different countries. Saying that sugar taxes have been shown not to work. I looked at the notes before you came in and Jennifer will cite another study which says it does work. We have evidence to is a proper theory? Yes. Public Health England backed the sugar tax and so do the health select committee and so do we as part of our plan. There is evidence from experimental studies in other countries showing it does work. Where in the world? Where does it work? There is a really good example in Mexico for example, where it is shown that it has reduced purchasing by 6%. And in the most socially deprived by 9% and they are the
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people that we need to target the most. I do agree that it's not the only initiative. We also want to see sugar reductions, reformulation of products and stricter rules in advertising and promotion. What do you say to people who say that at the end of the day we have an app which shows the sugar content of food coming you can change advertising, you can have government billboards and the rest of it, but at the end of the day the best way to ration something is price and that's why taxation as a disincentive works? In Denmark it clearly didn't work when it was tried. You know, this is a tax which would hit the poorest hardest and you need to get the message through that it involves moderation in all things and it would be an unfair attack on those who even just consume small amounts of sugary or fatty foods or whatever it might be. For them to be taxed additionally for enjoying those treats. Personal
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responsibility should be the key, give people the information to make wise and right choices. On that subject, Mark Knight has tweeted, why should responsible people be taxed for irresponsible people? There is the problem identified by Mark Knight that the tax covers everybody and everybody pays extra on their canon of whatever and actually he might just have it once a week but they will be taxed the same? If they are only having it once a week they are not going to be hugely impacted by the tax. It will impact people buying it day in day out as part of their staple diet. Health is so important and with levels of obesity and type two diabetes and tooth decay in adults it is completely shocking. We don't have the privilege of choosing what we do and don't implement any more and we have too implemented now. What do you say to the essential point that there are certain areas
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of life where the state needs to butt out, if somebody wants to drink lots of sugary drinks it is their choice, there is a separate argument about children, leave that to one side, but if an adult cognisant of all the risks decides to quaff a certain number of sugary drinks per day, that is their business. It is their business but it impacts the wider community and we know that the NHS costs due to obesity and type two diabetes which our lifestyle diseases which can be avoided, we are all having an impact really. It's not about taking away choice completely, it is about nudging people to make healthier choices most of the time and that is ultimately what we want to do. We have had the argument about nanny state for wearing seat belts and smoking regulations and they are widely accepted now. Sugar consumption should not be any different, we need to change the food environment and is not fair to