

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So those who can go to the movie are better able to afford the expenditure of money for luxuries than those who might only be able to purchase a can or bottle of pop, wouldn't you agree?

SENATOR SCHROCK: I think the argument is the same for either one, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But wouldn't you be getting at those with deeper pockets if you taxed the ticket than if you taxed the can of pop?

SENATOR SCHROCK: I don't think there would be much difference.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you think there are people who can afford to purchase a can of pop who may not be able to purchase a ticket to go to the show?

SENATOR SCHROCK: I don't know the answer to that.

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR SCHROCK: On an annual basis, I probably spend more money on pop than I do movie tickets. How about yourself?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But we can't even consider you because you're in that realm of income that people such as myself cannot even contemplate. We say the words, but they don't register with us. You're so far out of where we are, but anyway that is all I would ask Senator Schrock. I'm opposed to this amendment. I think it's clear what this amendment and other amendments are designed to do and as they come rolling in, I will oppose them and then we'll see where we ultimately will rest. But I will mention to Senator Bradford (sic) that if this amendment is attached to his bill, his bill I'm sure, it's curtains for it, judgment day.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I am against this change also. I wish we would stop and think about some of the precedents that we set from time to time. I suppose to start with the most disturbing thing to me about this is to watch the phenomena occur one more time and the phenomena that I'm talking about is the clash of two big special interest