

little bit, would you explain again why we need this amendment at all?

SENATOR WESELY: Sure, and as just clarification, the fine of five to twenty-five thousand is what we have now if you operate without a license, and so they just carried it over to if you didn't train as you are supposed to, and that was the consistent statute I was referencing for you. What it is intended to do is where you have a problem where a company is to train their employees under the statute and they don't do it, right now the department can only intercede and fine employees for not being trained when really the responsibility should be placed on the business to train those employees. So they felt that it was not a fair sanction for this problem, and I agreed. I thought that and so I offered the amendment but that is the reasoning behind it.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Thank you. And when you say an asbestos project in this amendment, then that is looking back to the definition...

SENATOR WESELY: Right.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: ...of asbestos project which is defined in the bill itself.

SENATOR WESELY: That is right.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Thank you. I appreciate the questions being responded to. I honestly don't know how I feel about this amendment, and I suppose it is somewhat my fault for not looking at the original language in the amendment. I am concerned about some of the ramifications, and while Senator Goodrich said something that I don't agree with as far as trusting the department, I do...I don't necessarily think of them as doing something untrustworthy but I do recognize that sometimes reasonableness can be defined in differing degrees and I am a little concerned about this amendment as it stands right now, even with the lower numbers that Senator Wesely does recommend as to whether that is indeed reasonable or not, and I will be listening to the debate for further chances to be convinced.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Any other discussion? Senator Wesely, would you care to close?