

Senator Hefner, I couldn't believe talking about his amendment discouraged drug use, and he thought my amendment encouraged drug use. Well, that's ridiculous. How does drug treatment encourage drug use? Drug treatment is to solve drug abuse. It's not to encourage it, it's trying to discourage it, stop it, deal with the problem, that's what drug treatment is all about. But as we talk about the drug problems around this state in this election year, all we talk about is the punitive side of it, throw them in jail, lock the door and throw away the key, that's how we deal with the drug problem. The way you deal with the drug problem is hopefully not to have it start in the first place and we've got to deal with that, but once it's there, don't ignore it, treat it, deal with it, try and get people beyond it. And that's what I'm suggesting this bill does not now have in place, a way to, yes, encourage people to use treatment, but how do you pay for it? That's the other side of the equation. Now, Senator Coordsen talked about DPI will pay for individuals, their treatment cost. Well, they will provide some treatment. There is a program as I mentioned in my opening, but that program at Hastings is backlogged into months and months of wait before you can get into it because of the lack of services and that's one of the things, again, Senator Arlene Nelson and myself had legislation to try and increase the alcohol tax, put more money into these programs because they're way underfunded and overutilized at this point, unable to meet the demand. So we have a program in place but it's inadequate, it won't work. It's just not enough. There are lots of programs besides that as Senator Coordsen again talked about, but the real question is, can people afford it, will it meet the need? And I simply say the answer is yes, programs are there but people can't afford it, or if they can get into a certain program, they have to wait so long it's just not working. The conformity issue that Senator Coordsen talked about, I'm not an expert on. I don't know about conformity, but I don't know that the amendment we adopted is conformity either. I understand there's a further amendment that will come in that hopefully will be. But I think that we ought to do what we feel is right in terms of policy, what is the correct policy? And if that's conformity or not conformity, you know, we can work that out, but at this point, I'd like us to move forward and adopt this amendment and perhaps further refinement would be needed, but we could do that between now and the time it would ultimately pass. I think that it also needs to be very clear that we're not requiring employees, or employers to provide the insurance. We're simply saying that...