

bring this out and you've got to ask questions. You've got to decide, you know, where are people concerned? What is the language that bothers them? I have picked up a lot from the discussion and my sense is the following, that the intent I think, hopefully, you understand where Senator Lynch and I and the committee are coming from. The intent is one I hope everybody could agree to that people out there that can't afford to get health care access or don't have the advice or the expertise out there ought to be able to get it. You know, that's just the right thing to do. So I hope we're not arguing that point. The semantics of the bill, the question of coordination Senator Scofield and others have raised, Senator Smith, are legitimate and I think there is a way to draft language to deal with some of that. We have an Advisory Council involved here. The suggestion would be to again deal with that council and having them make sure they consult with the local hospital that Senator Lamb talks about, consult with the local area agency on aging, have down, you know, the direction from us that we don't want them, as they develop this report, to do it in isolation. That's clearly not our intent anyway, but we can just make it a little clearer that these people will be talked to and discuss what's happening now and what's in place now and have that as part of the bill as they develop the plan. So, number one, we can do that, a consultation requirement and we can easily do that. And the second thing is we're not out to duplicate any existing services. I mean, if they're in place now, obviously, that's not where we're heading. They're there. We could easily add language to this bill that says that you don't have services that duplicate existing programs or existing services and then you move in and you fill the gaps, just like we talked about. It's simple to deal with, I think, at least a couple of those problems. Senator Labedz's problem is about the abortion thing. If she has some specific language that she can come back to us with, you know, we'll certainly look at it because that isn't our intent to get into that area anyway. So all of the specific problems, all the concerns that are there I know are sincere, I know are legitimate and I think there is an answer to each and everyone of them. So I would ask you to reject the kill motion. We're almost out of time this morning. Let's...we'll come back to it tomorrow and in the meantime we'll go to work on this and if you come back to us as we get done this morning and have specific things you want to see in the bill, let us know about it and when we come back to it on General File we'll work with you on it. I think this is too good an issue, too important an initiative to lose it and to not