

opportunity for us to add one little chink in our armor to do that. So I do not support the Hall amendment and I hope that you won't either. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I appreciate Senator Hall offering this amendment because now I can put on a hat that I'm more comfortable with which is opposing further exemptions and, obviously, that's what this would broaden the scope, but the only argument that I guess I can give is a historical one. It is historically the statutes have recognized that animals for human consumption, and I don't want to get myself tripped up here, but for human consumption I suspect was a parallel with other manufacturing and I don't want to say they're the same because they, obviously, are not, but I rather suspect that that was the concept originally and it was to narrow the scope of the exemption. This, obviously, would broaden it and it's probably a fine line when you leave to go to another in some cases, but I think at least historically this has had a narrow definition as related to animals for food consumption as opposed to others and that distinction probably should be retained.

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

SENATOR COORDSEN: A question of Senator Hall if he would reply, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Yes, sir.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Senator Hall, out home is dog. Now we're on a water system in which we pay \$10.65 for every 1,000 gallons of water that is sales taxable. Now if this amendment were to be adopted, could I deduct from that perhaps the 20 gallons or so a month that I run out for dog?

SENATOR HALL: I'm sorry, I apologize.

SENATOR COORDSEN: You weren't listening.

SENATOR HALL: Naah, tell me about old dog again.