

restaurants in my district that I'm not sure what I'm eating but it, you know, I pay sales tax when I go out the door so it really doesn't matter. There was a recent article in the Wall Street Journal not too long ago, a few months back about how rat is a specialty and people actually fight to have certain territories over in the Orient for purposes of catching them. They then sell them to restaurants and it's a delicacy. I mean, what I'm trying to point out here in a rather interesting way, I think, is that, look, what's our tax policy going to be as it relates to veterinary medicines? Veterinary medicines apply to animals, they apply to animals that we eat and they apply to animals that are companions for people, in many cases. Those I think sometimes are just as important to the health and well being of humans as the animals that we eat. I don't know if Senator Preister is a person who has pets. He clearly doesn't eat animals so he can make use with the adoption of this amendment for purposes of LB 106, along with a number of other individuals out there who wouldn't have the ability under our tax code to make use of that. The question is, because, frankly, to be honest with you, on one hand what would qualify for a tax exemption under the bill without the amendment could very well be taxed if used for some other animal. In other words, there's, I'm sure, certain types of feed. Water clearly is something. There are veterinary medicines that would be cross-over medicines most likely. Clearly, there is feed that would be when used for one animal, because that animal is ordinarily constitutes food for human consumption, would be tax exempt under this bill and in another circumstance when used basically in the same vein, used for the same purpose but just happened to be used on a different animal, that would not be tax exempt. I mean, I'm thinking most importantly about, and I don't know how it applies, for example, to a place like the Henry Doorly Zoo which happens to be in my district. But none of those animals down there, I mean, the giraffe is not what you would call an animal that ordinarily constitutes food for human consumption. Now we're going to exempt the veterinary medicines and the feed and water for the normal type of animal that you look for for purposes of human consumption. I guess that means cattle; I'm sure that we're talking about chickens, we're probably talking about turkeys, hogs, we're talking about any number of other kinds of animals that are out there that would fit that definition, whatever it may be, but there's a great number of other animals that use those same products, make use of them but because they don't happen to fall in this category, whatever that means, ordinarily constitute food for human