

going to set up a special department for this. I think what we should do and what we have been doing is basing need, is basing help, government help on need, regardless of the age group whether it is young or the middle-aged or the aging. The government should help the needy. They should help the aging when they are in need but they should not give particular help to a particular age group just because it is a particular age group. Secondly, in terms of the long-term political outlook, the number of people who are aging in our society of course is becoming greater and greater as a percentage and that always means in a democratic setting that that group will become more and more powerful. In a political sense I think if there is a danger in something that we should be looking at in the future, it is how to balance political power in the system, how to protect the small number of workers that there will be in the future against strong political majorities. And I am not saying that should be the reason for voting for or against this bill but I am saying that we should be thinking about counterbalancing political forces. We should be thinking about whether we want to institutionalize the political force of any particular age group and I think that is what you are doing if you pass this bill. The detail in the bill is really...is tremendous. The bill is very detailed. It sets up the Department of Aging and whether or not you vote for the A bill is not going to make any difference if you vote for this bill. The bureaucracy will get set up so I don't think you should talk yourself into voting this bill by promising that you are going to vote against the A bill. The damage will have been done if you agree with me that institutionalization in and of itself is philosophically incorrect. But if you would look at page...the Department of Aging is set up at the state level and then the Department of Aging sets up minimal standards for all these different area agencies that will be set up pursuant to the bill and it approves the area agencies and it is going to insist that they are comprehensive, coordinated service agencies. They are going to set up service centers. On page 4 and 5 of the bill you will see a detailed listing of the different types of activities and services that are going to be performed or that can be performed with the language "including but not limited to." So the bill is unlimited as to the types of services that can be performed by these different agencies. I think that that is overly broad and a mistake. Back on page 10 of the bill you can read the functions that the different area agencies will have and you can see that the functions are very comprehensive, conducting public hearings and studies and assessments of need, representing the interests of older people to public officials. If you don't particularly like advocacy agencies you are not going to like this one because that is what you are clearly