

feels that this is a more clear and concise definition. There may be some argument, I can understand Senator Beck making an argument. But I would, at this time, encourage caution. One word change, one slight change in how we phrase something can make all the difference on this. And before we fool around with a definition, we better be absolutely sure what it ends up doing. We know what we have now. We've been working with it for a year. Let us not change the definition at this point. Let us go on with the bill, as it's been amended. It does a lot of good things for a lot of people who have had concerns. And rather than potentially cause a lot of problems with further amendment, I think we're ready to move on the bill. So I would oppose this amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Hannibal.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I would like to ask Senator Wesely a question, if he would respond.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Wesely.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Senator Wesely, as you just said in your remarks, we are operating under this definition from NESHAP, and that's a revised definition, is it not?

SENATOR WESELY: Yes, it's been revised, um-huh.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: The original definition, put out by NESHAP, was using the word "when dry" in it, just as Senator Beck is offering as far as part of the definition of friable asbestos. And now they have....And, as a matter of fact, back in those days, in '84, the other definitions of friable asbestos was under worker protection rule, 1987, was using the words "when dry" in the definition, as was the AHERA rules, as recently as October of '87, using the words "when dry". Now, it's my understanding that NESHAP has changed this definition back, just about a year ago. Can you tell me why that definition was changed, and what the thoughts were?

SENATOR WESELY: I'm not sure, I don't know the answer to that question.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Okay. Well, Senator Beck raises an issue that, quite frankly, I don't know what the effects are. And I