

SENATOR BROMM: Well, I figure you're using so much time anyway, I just, you know, kind of help you a little bit so I...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But here's the thing.

SENATOR BROMM: ...let you rephrase the question.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, it's not just to use time but if you agree, regardless of the example that I would give, that in order for the exemption to exist, all of these things must occur within this state, then that was the only question I was asking you. I had thought you were shaking your head indicating that that language should not be taken out in this state.

SENATOR BROMM: Well, I didn't mean to trick you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, you didn't trick me. I just didn't understand your body language so that was a defect on my part. I have to become more literate in interpreting the signs that some of my colleagues would make. But at any rate, if that is understood and that is agreed to and that is what is intended, then there's no need to change the language there, but I would want to ask Senator Dierks a question now about something else in this portion of the law. Senator Dierks, in line 5 of the area we're dealing with, are the words "which are otherwise used in caring for any form of animal life of a kind..."

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...the products of which would go for food or pelts that are used for clothing", what does caring for mean?

SENATOR DIERKS: Well, taking care of.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So that would mean including, if you use powder on them, if you use curry combs, if you use brushes, like animals for show that are ordinarily used for food, anything that you use in taking care of those animals is exempt from the tax.

SENATOR DIERKS: No, that's not so. Only those items that are used for ag chemicals, pharmaceuticals, biologicals. We've exempted those items but not those instruments that are used in the care like syringes or metal ear tags, those kind of things