

Wednesday, September 30, 2009

Check the price tag first **Cost of regulations should be weighed up front.**

A recent study, commissioned by the government, no less, revealed that it costs California small businesses an average of \$134,000 a year to comply with state regulations.

A previous study by the same university professors found regulations to enforce the state's Global Warming Solutions Act will cost small businesses another \$50,000 a year. Merely complying with these arbitrary regulations can be the difference between profit and loss.

These studies show how government's intrusive regulations harm the economy. That's why we hope Senate Bill 356, by Democrat Roderick D. Wright of Inglewood, can be revived. SB356 has languished in the Senate appropriations committee since May.

The complaint is that government agencies could be delayed and incur added costs if required to weigh the economic effects of regulations on small businesses before adopting them.

What a grand irony for the government to be forced to determine how much economic damage its utopian rule-making causes before inflicting the damage.

For decades, government increasingly has required companies to incur substantial added costs to study the potential harm their plans might have on flora and fauna before being given approval for private developments. But when the tables are turned, and government is asked to consider the harm it inflicts on human institutions, lawmakers balk.

California has 12.2 percent unemployment, and employers are moving to more business-friendly states. This state's tax system already is rated 48th-least-friendly to business. The hidden costs of regulations after being passed through to people is nearly \$177 billion, or more than \$13,800 per household.

Clearly, if the environmental cost measured in harm to snails and shrubbery deserves study before developers can receive government approval, the economic effects on Californians certainly deserve study before granting government approval to impose new regulatory economic harm.