

very much, some of those are very, very strong medicines. And there are some very complicated things that can happen, should they be taking some other kind of medicine and you treat them with these strong medicines that are used to treat glaucoma, and there can be some very, very severe side effects from that. And I do... And I'm not convinced that these optometrists have that ability to do that. And in the bill it says telecommunications is the way. We're going to start diagnosing glaucoma over the telephone? I think that's absolutely absurd to think that we can do that. And you're also taking, I agree with Senator Kristensen totally, we're taking a grave step backwards by saying, okay, now the Board of Optometry is going to be in control. Why would the Board of Optometry, which is the lesser qualified, be the one that we put in control of a situation? I think that makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. These are medical treatments, with very serious consequences, if you do it wrong, and you just... we do not... we simply should not allow the Board of Optometry to be in control here. They simply do not have the expertise to be in control here. And, Senator Moore, you can compromise if you like, and you can compromise the health of your constituency, but I'm not going to do that. And I don't think we ought to accept this amendment. I think that Senator Schellpeper worked very hard to get the committee... to get the amendments attached that were necessary in committee. The bill came out of committee, assuming that those committee amendments would be adopted. This is an aberration of the committee process. You put on some amendments that you don't really want to get the bill out of committee, and then you go turn right around and change those amendments right on the floor of the Legislature. You got your votes to get it out of committee, now you're going to turn right around and change that and say, well, we didn't really mean that. And you're going to harm some of those people who said they didn't want that bill out of committee, unless those committee amendments were attached. I think this is an aberration of that process, and I don't think we should do that. I think those kinds of compromises and stuff ought to be worked out ahead of time, if you're going to do that. Otherwise, you face the bill straight up, and you put the committee amendments on here and then you start amending those. This is a nice way of doing it, you don't have to have 25 votes to do it. You can amend the committee amendments without 20... you don't have to do that. I think that that's a poor, poor...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.