

that right?

SENATOR DIERKS: Veterinary medicines which...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Is with respect to only one of those three categories that is defined in the bill, is that correct?

SENATOR DIERKS: Which handout are you looking at, Senator Beutler? Is it this one?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yeah, I am looking at the handout that is entitled, Sales & Use Tax Exemptions for Animal Medications.

SENATOR DIERKS: Okay.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, that, as I read through it, basically, is a comparison of those states that you show there with respect to category number (c) in the bill, which is veterinary medicines, is that correct?

SENATOR DIERKS: I think that is probably correct. I am not sure...

SPEAKER WITHEM: Time.

SENATOR DIERKS: ...where you are coming from on the bill.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR BEUTLER: I will come back. Thank you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, when we get through with all of the justifications that have been offered, it comes down to a situation of senators who represent a certain constituency trying to remove as much tax burden from that constituency as possible. That is all that this is. I believe that when the number of items on which a sales tax can be levied is reduced, you reduce the tax base, and if you do something serious about property tax relief as it is called, and money which formerly was derived from a property tax is going to have to come from income tax and sales tax, those are the only two sources the state has, and the state is going to be asked to make up more money for these local subdivisions. As you restrict the number of items on which a sales tax can be levied, you have to place a higher sales tax on the number of