Allen, Ellen L.

From: Rebecca [rebeccafrog@yahoo. corn]
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2003 1:59 PM

To: nprm@ttb.gov
Subject: Attn: Notice No. 4
Chief, Regulations and Procedures Division
Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau
P.O. Box 50221
Washington, D.C. 20091-0221

Dear Chief, Regulations and Procedures Division:

I oppose the proposed regulation in TTB Notice No. 4 requiring a change in the way these drinks are made because rather than protecting consumers, this regulation would impose a burden on the manufacturers that may end up costing the consumers more, and will not result in a higher quality
product, nor one that is safer. Rather than imposing restrictions on the way flavored malt beverages are made, it makes far better sense to require stricter labelling standards, so that consumers know what they are drinking. As it stands, the only information manufacturers of alcoholic beverages are required to provide to consumers regarding the contents of the bottle are alcohol percentage, country of origin, and if it's wine, that it contains sulfites. Rather than requiring a certain percentage of the alcohol in a flavored malt beverage to come from the base beverage, it would be far more bene! ficial to the public to require producers of tiavored malt beverages to indicate clearly on the bottle what percentage of the alcohol contained in the beverage comes from the base malt beverage, what percentage of the alcohol comes from other sources, and what those sources are. The way malt beverages are made does not need to change. Malt beverages as they currently exist are perfectly safe for human consumption. Requiring standards in manufacturing is a good thing, but those standards should be for the protection of the consumer. Requiring manufacturers to provide more information to the consumer is far greater protection than requiring manufacturers to change safe methods of production.

Thank you,

Rebecca Davidson

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Shopping - with improved product search

10/21/2003