

sort of bill like Senator Wehrbein had, but this isn't even my bill and I feel on the hot seat. But this always happens every start of the session. We have a little more time and we take the time with the legislation, and I don't think that's a bad thing. I want to recognize, first off, Senator Chambers is legitimate in raising concerns but I hope that we have a legitimate response to that and that is the concern about having what was a specific bill, dealing with a specific problem and having a specific solution. We know that there's a problem in terms of hearing impaired access to services with DPI. We heard a number of people testify. We've had the bill before from Senator Crosby. The committee advanced the bill in the past. We are sensitive to the concerns. We are willing to respond to those concerns. The problem was that this particular section goes beyond that specific problem, beyond that specific solution and has kind of a blanket, thou shalt comply with the ADA, and that was, I think, a legitimate concern on our part as much as it was the department's part as to what does that mean. Does that mean now there is an entitlement to services? Does that mean that there's a liability in terms of the state, in terms of the state action that wasn't there before? And I think the answer is yes, at least in the second point. The entitlement part, back to the uncertain aspects of ADA because it's unclear exactly what does that mean. In every case, it's a case by case, let's think it through, let's talk it through, let's talk it through, let's make a decision process that seems to be in place right now. But you take this out of the bill, you don't lose what Senator Crosby is trying to do. You accomplish attacking the problem she's identified and the hearing impaired community has identified. We specifically have a solution. We've moved forward with it, so we don't lose anything from what Senator Crosby is trying to do. But we do lose, I think, the potential of a greater problem that we may not know about, that I think exists with this language. So we are willing to go the distance that Senator Crosby wants to go in addressing the specific. It's the unknown that the committee is unwilling to venture into at this point. And if Senator Crosby and others could give us specifically what this means, specifically what this may cost, specifically what this may entitle people to, then I think maybe we might have a different perspective. But we haven't heard that side of it. We've only heard the other side of it and I think that uncertainty is what is causing us to back off and furthermore this is almost going to be...I was going to use some of this in my closing, but the other thing is we typically shy away from the State Legislature adhering to