

destroying somebody else's property, because, at the same time, they were telling me that one of the provisions in the Preamble of the Constitution was to say that this Constitution was to protect life, liberty and property. Property was a very important item in the minds of the colonists, unless it belonged to somebody else and they destroyed it. Now I wonder if, when this tax is imposed on pop, if that should be successful, and some people who on principle and with the same patriotic beatings of the heart that these colonists had would hijack a pop truck, would that be considered a political statement, a mere act of civil disobedience? Or would it be considered a crime? We know what it would be considered. So we have a situation where we're dealing with a beverage that descends in a direct line from the beverage that led to the Boston Tea Party. Suppose people were so upset with this type of tax today that they took similar action to that which we were taught when we were children is a great thing to do, that's the way you fight these matters. I meant, they talked to us, Senator Hall, about this fragrant brew drunk from these delicate crystal cups with a gold filigree leaf and you cock the little finger, the pinkie, as they call it, as you savor the aroma, then you sip it and wash it around on your palate, then swallow it, or if you're the equivalent of Joe Lunchbucket in those days, you pour it in what might have been like a Mason jar and just swill it down because that's what you had to do between your activities of being a patriot, destroying the property of the enemy and so forth. If those were good things, if that is what we're taught in history, why cannot we resist in the same way today? Why do I have to stand on this floor of the Legislature, outnumbered, and try to persuade you to do something when it would be so much easier to just rally opponents on the street and make sure that if you're going to harm our interests in this way, we will do an equivalent amount of analogous harm to you, but that wouldn't be accepted and it wouldn't be allowed. So here I stand with probably a talent to achieve more dramatic results in a different form than I can here, but I'm bound to be here. Why? I'm looking at Senator Hall. I don't know if he even has an answer. As I talked, I think I saw a glitter and a gleam in his eye and he was almost ready to say, hey, we ought to get together and I think we can bring about some changes on matters that we've both been interested in changing in a way more effective and expeditious than we can do on the floor of the Legislature. But in the process of saying these things, I want it clear that I feel it is inappropriate to raise the sales tax. As Senator Withem pointed out correctly, it does take a larger