

discussion going on over there, which will perhaps shorten some of the discussion, but as I have generally understood the language, and certainly the word "storage" but much of this is language that normally occurs in these kinds of areas of exemptions to cover a number of areas. I believe the word "storage" probably is in there recognizing that you might buy a case full of items to be used over a period of time, and so you may be storing it until you are going to use it, but I think it is to make it fairly much all-inclusive, and I actually don't believe that...I think some of the discussion is fine to have because it clarifies the wording but I think they also...is a format that is not unusual, in fact, it is usual to occur, and it is to cover a wide variety of transactions and which relieves any question of whether the exemption occurs only if it is used immediately or some other form. It's to make an exception that would be applied to all other exemptions in a like way.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, here's what we are talking about, and I know they will sometimes lift language from another part of the statutes. Sometimes that works and sometimes it doesn't, but what is happening here with this terminology "in this state" we are creating an exemption. That exemption is governed by the language which creates it, no matter what is said anyplace else. So if, in order for any of these items, including feed, to be exempt from the tax, it must be consumed in this state. So if you want to leave the language in, I would argue that you are not creating an exemption unless the feed, water, veterinary medicines, or whatever else is subject to being consumed would have to be consumed in this state. I want to ask Senator Maurstad a question or two.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Maurstad, would you respond?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Maurstad, you apparently disagree with that interpretation.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: No, I don't, Senator Chambers. But I did stick around even though you gave me warning. I could have ducked out on you, but I stuck around. I don't disagree with you. I just don't see it as a big deal. I am supporting LB 106 because it is going to be good for the constituents in my district, and I can't think of an instance where what you are referring to, being consumed in this state, won't be consumed in