

groups. And whenever they clash, whenever there is a question with regard to the allocation of resources as between those two groups, do you know what we do for them? We say, okay, compromise and the compromise is taxpayer pays. You both have your little piles. We both keep our little piles and we tax the taxpayer more. That's precisely what is happening in this case, not to the full extent of the amount of money being talked about, but at least to about half of it and we do it time and time again. I guess I'm sensitive to it. We do it with judicial redistricting. They fight about not wanting to lose a judge so what's the compromise, a reallocated judge, so what's the compromise? Add another judge. And if you stop and think about it, we do that time and time and time again and I guess that's why even though I'm a believer in positive government, it gets real discouraging in here. It gets real discouraging because we let them off the hook. We don't require hard thinking about the allocation of resources. We let them off the hook and we're about to let them off the hook again by taxing pop which has no more relationship to teachers salaries, has less relationship in this instance than the Highway Trust Funds do. How can we justify that logically? Does pop have a sales tax on it already? Yes, it does, so we're adding to the sales tax that's already on there. No uniformity clause on the sales tax, thank God, and boy, we'll make good use of that I guess because now we're putting...we're adding to the sales tax effectively on pop by putting another tax on that. Somewhat like cigarettes I guess, but at least with cigarettes I in my own mind can justify that because I'm trying to discourage the smoking of cigarettes. But I guess I can't say in my own mind that I'm really out to discourage the drinking of carbonated beverages. Can you? Does somebody in here have a passion about carbonated beverages? A couple hands, okay. Well, I guess we'll go off and get them too. And then we have products of course upon which there is no sales tax. We tax fertilizers but you know even with the tax that's on them it's only about a fourth of what a real sales tax would be. And then, of course, there are services, no tax at all on those, but of course there are other powerful interest groups that prevent us from going out and doing the right thing there. Well, I guess we're boxed in, aren't we? We've got to tax pop. Too bad. Thank you.

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

SENATOR ROBAK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I strongly support Senator Schrock's amendment. He stopped in my