

SPEAKER: Any further discussion? Senator Carpenter.

SENATOR CARPENTER: I just want to say one thing, my friends. The liquor wholesaler today can charge them anything they want for liquor, with or without the freight rate in there. There is no limitation which the seven liquor wholesalers can charge any licensee for any case of liquor he wants to charge him. I don't understand how this is any concern. If they want to do what some people are apprehensive, they can do that without this bill. They can raise the price of Cutty-Sark by posting the Liquor Commission \$5.00 a case. They can raise the price of wine, anything they want to. This just doesn't happen and I want to call your attention that this opposition comes from Omaha. They think the people outstate ought to be kept in the present rut to the extent that it exists. I would think that every Senator outside the city of Omaha certainly ought to vote to reject this proposed amendment to this bill.

CLERK: A motion on the desk, Mr. President.

SPEAKER: Read the motion.

CLERK: I move the previous question. Signed, Senator DeCamp.

SPEAKER: Do I see five hands. I do. Those in favor of the previous question which means to close debate, vote aye. Those opposed vote nay. Have you all voted? The clerk will record.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 1 nay, to close debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER: Senator Proud will close.

SENATOR PROUD: Well, Mr. President, I would just say that to me and I think to a lot of people, this amendment that is presently on the bill doesn't make any sense. How would you feel if you said that a hardware dealer in Scottsbluff has to pay the same transportation as a hardware dealer in Fremont. That's what this is all about and this doesn't affect just Omaha. It affects the whole eastern part of the state clear up to the middle of it. Furthermore, it is quite apparent, it's obvious, you'd have to be blind, completely blind, not to see that this ties right in with LB 366, which is, as I understand it, to raise the cost of liquor by 15% and so what is happening is that the tavern owners, some of whom have helped me in prior elections, tell the tavern owners, "Boys, if you don't go along on 111, you are not going to get 366!" This is a strong arm tactic not unknown in the history of legislation. But it is wrong, any way you slice it. Therefore, it is quite clear. Well, I have a note here. It says, cancel dealers from hauling own liquor. I don't know about that. I suppose that could be another offshoot of it. It's clearly bad legislation. Now, it is quite clear that since they are so closely tied, both of the bills will do one thing. There is no question about that. They will increase the cost to the consumer and in some measure, it seems to me, that one of our purposes down here is to look after the consumer, even if it is the consumer of booze. Why should we increase the cost to him. Why should we mark it up to 15%, as is done in LB 366. Why should we increase the cost of booze on transportation. There is no valid reason. Now it is pretty hard this afternoon to get 25 votes on anything because we don't have enough members here. I understand that but I want to make a point of this. Of course, it is going to decrease, this 111, the cost of transportation to anybody in Scottsbluff who may have a liquor license. That's quite clear but I don't think we should do that. Therefore, I urge you to adopt this amendment which deletes the Carpenter amendment.