

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Senator Beutler, I suspect that could be addressed in some rule of conduct that the Executive Board could take up. The truth of the matter is when we do tax rate issues they're sometimes extraordinarily difficult to do and the understanding...the last time we increased the liquor taxes was in 1981 and that again was a product of an understanding that was arrived at between the Revenue Committee and the industry and the understanding was that the rates would not be affected for another four years. So now four years later we're going back and we, frankly, have arrived at another understanding and when I say, we, I mean the Revenue Committee knows what the understanding is. The industry also knows that the body turns over. It also knows that the body will not be bound by the understanding. On the other hand at least the understanding is set forth clearly.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Johnson, let me ask you, for a fellow like me who is voting on this by virtue of that committee report statement and by virtue of this letter that has been passed around indicating a signed and sealed agreement between certain lobbyists and certain members of the Legislature, am I to have the feeling that I, too, am bound by this agreement? Should I vote for this bill? Should the Legislature generally have that sense or feeling?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: I don't think that you are personally bound by that agreement, nor do I think that...(interruption)

SENATOR BEUTLER: Am I endorsing this particular agreement of the Revenue Committee?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: I can't say that you are endorsing that particular agreement of the Revenue Committee, but I can tell you that the Revenue Committee and its individual members, when they put together the agreement, said very clearly to the industry that we would not individually encourage a change until October, 1989, and that, of course, is the best that I can do. The best I can ever do is to give my personal assurance and that's the best that any other person can do, but the Legislature as a whole, obviously, cannot give its personal assurance with respect to subsequent legislative sessions.