

So, really I don't think we have got a lot to holler about. And far as cost to an individual, wouldn't you be willing to pay one penny extra for a can of beer? I think we would. I really see no problems with this. So I sure support the amendment and I think we should get along with it. Thank you.

SENATOR MARSH: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DECAMP: Question.

SENATOR MARSH: The question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. Those in favor of ceasing debate please vote aye, opposed no. Senator Marsh voting aye.

CLERK: Senator Marsh voting yes.

SENATOR MARSH: The Clerk will record.

CLERK: 31 ayes, 0 nays to cease debate.

SENATOR MARSH: Debate is ceased. Senator Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, members of the Legislature, I have the pleasure to present to you the committee amendments to LB 280. I am closing on the committee amendments. The committee amendments are very straightforward. You will find them discussed in your bill book under LB 280. They would over a period of three years, starting October 1, 1985, increase the beer tax from 14 cents a gallon to 23 cents a gallon; the wine tax for nonfortified wine from 65 cents a gallon to 75 cents a gallon; the fortified wine tax from \$1.25 a gallon to \$1.35 a gallon; and finally the hard liquor or distilled spirits tax from \$2.75 a gallon to \$3.00 a gallon. The questions that have been raised at this point about the committee amendments, as I can gather, are the following. Number one, why should we increase alcohol taxes at all knowing that good solid business people run our bars and our packaged liquor stores and this tax increase will simply burden them? The answer is very simple. Economists have discovered over the years that the demand for alcohol is such that tax increases on alcohol do not significantly reduce the demand. In other words, the demand curve in an economic sense is inelastic. So the increase in the taxes will not drive customers away. Furthermore, some of the people who are