

this language, in any way, improves the bill. And it might actually hinder the bill. Let me give you one example of when it might. As you know I have a counseling background. I've only done career counseling, I'm not really qualified to do family counseling.

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR SCOFIELD: But I have talked to people who have. And once in a while, even when you're working with a kid, the kid's mother may exhibit an interest in some kind of service that might involve a desire to find contraception services. It's an acceptable and ethical practice for a counselor to give information to a client when they ask for it. It is not acceptable for counselors, it's unprofessional for counselors, as a matter of fact, unethical to give people advice. You only give them information when they ask for it. But I think this bill or this particular amendment might so jeopardize the possibility of some counselor in the line of duty from actually giving information that was directly requested by an adult woman or man, for that matter. I think it's language that doesn't improve the bill, and really misses the real objectives of the bill. So I would ask you to reject this amendment. Let's make it apply to kids, let's all make sure that it continues to go out to communities, and that it gets at these problems that we're seeing that we're all so terribly aware of right now. I think we can do a lot to fight child abuse. I think we can do a lot to increase responsiveness of governmental services to kids. And I would ask you just not to bog this bill down with what has become a very contentious debate on this floor. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Schmit, please, followed by Senator Labeledz and Senator Dierks. Senator Schmit, please. Senator Labeledz, please.

SENATOR LABEDZ: I'll close.

PRESIDENT: Senator Dierks, please.

SENATOR DIERKS: Mr. President, members of the body, I just would like to stand here and approve the amendment that Senator Labeledz is bringing. Senator Scofield, I think that if the intent is not there to do the things that Senator Labeledz wants not done, then it shouldn't hurt the bill to have the intent language put in that she does want done. I think it's just as