

SENATOR CHAMBERS: There's only one definition. But if it can be broader than that, if it can apply to other things, then we need the definition as somebody has seen fit to put one in this bill. They just have not been as careful. They decided that if feeds are indefinite in number and description in kind so we'll say feed shall include, they should have said include but not be limited to or some such thing as that. But they have a way of using the lazy person's method of writing legislation. However they wrote one definition, they're going to use the same language for every definition whether it is appropriate or not. I'm trying to narrow this one. And if you all don't want to adopt the amendment, so be it. But that's what the amendment would do. It's designed to say that veterinary medicines means that and that alone.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President and members. I want to rise in opposition to Senator Chambers' amendment because Senator Chambers is basically trying to make the bill a better bill and my fear is that the point that he's able to narrow the definitions enough and clarify the language, then any hope of not having the proposal pass will probably be extinguished and it's not because I don't think the amendment is a good amendment. I think clearly if you're going to have this kind of a proposal in place, it ought to be as narrow as possible so that there is little room for interpretation on the part of the department. I don't care whether the department drafted this or not because what happens is one person will draft it and then another four or five folks will interpret it and depending on who you get a specific day, you might get one interpretation and depending on who heads up the department at any given time, that in itself can change, and that is not a reflection on anyone who is former or present in the capacity as the revenue commissioner, the question is just how we draft our proposals for purposes of their interpretation. And if you want to see the proposal as carefully drafted as possible, you ought to adopt the Chambers amendment. If you, like I am, in a certain vein, want to ensure that it's as narrowly drafted as possible, at the same time fear that somehow the amendment is going to allow first this one, then the subsequent one that deals with animals and I can just see the balance of them coming as Senator Chambers will draft them or as he agrees to agree with Senator Dierks between now and Select File, the measure is probably going to fly and we're looking at a \$3.5 million hit because of