

focus the Attorney General, or require him to focus on this particular area, perhaps with a little more emphasis than traditionally they have in the past. Now I...that's my understanding...

SENATOR HALL: Now, I...

SENATOR BROMM: ...just from discussions. I don't have any proof of that, Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Okay. And I mean that was the other question is, when does this come into play, or when has this come into play? Maybe Senator Jones will...will...and I know we're on a Bromm amendment to the committee amendments and apologize for that discussion, but I think it's important to the overall bill.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: Senator Bromm, thank you very much, I appreciate your responses. But I would...it would appear to me, just from the reading of the bill and the current language that's in the statute, that this is not necessary, that it probably is being done, and I would argue it has been done by the Attorney General's Office for purposes of complying with the statute as presently written and that the issue of the additional language does not add anything to that requirement upon the Attorney General's Office, but maybe there's a specific instance. Maybe there's examples out there that folks will point to that will explain why the need for this additional, or I guess expanded upon duty. But I would believe that the proposal, the requirement is already embodied in the law as it's presently drafted.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Hall. Senator Beutler, to speak to the Bromm amendment.

SENATOR BEUTLER: A question of Senator Jones, if I may, Senator Jones.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Jones.