

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, I will ask you, Senator Wickersham, if you've had a chance to digest it, how do you feel about that? Because similar language is already in the existing law on the previous page.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: The language in subsection (c) is more generic, and I believe that it is useful in this process. And again it goes back to the earlier discussion we had. I think it is useful in the process to know what this particular element may involve in the way of a fiscal impact and to have that set out for arguably separate examination. So I think it is a useful provision, and I believe it would draw appropriate attention to the issue, as it's being discussed, in the regulatory process.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So you're saying you're opposed to his amendment?

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Yes, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, that's what I was trying to find out. I'm still in favor of the amendment. If more is sought here than merely an attempt to open up the rule making process, then I can understand Senator Wickersham's objection. If, as I think I understood him to say,...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...that the purpose of this exercise is to open up the rule making process and assure that certain things will be discussed and considered then I don't see the need for keeping this redundant language when the requirement to handle this material has already been laid out on the previous page. His language says, but not necessarily a quantification of the fiscal impact, that's what the other language says, so I don't see the need to put it in the bill twice. Maybe what Senator Beutler ought to do is what I did, tell him he's bringing this up for discussion but he doesn't want you to adopt it. This is one that I really think should be adopted. But I want to...how much time do I have on this one, because I...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Seven seconds.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then I won't ask Senator Jones the questions I was going to.