

amendment in the committee because I didn't think it belonged there and I don't think it belongs here now. I had a young man who came to me who was changing jobs and he was caught in between without any health insurance. His wife was pregnant so he went to the doctor and made an agreement with the doctor that if he would pay \$1,300 up front that the doctor would deliver the baby irregardless of the cost. He also went to the hospital, which happened to be a Methodist hospital, and for \$1,200 up front they would guarantee the delivery of the child. So this individual, over an eight-month period, raised \$2,500 so that his wife could deliver a baby, no insurance whatsoever. This individual now has a job but he still has health insurance. That health insurance, however, has a \$1,000 deductibility. Now if you've got people out there working with high deductibles trying to provide health insurance, then we are saying we're going to give to other people, without any cost, health insurance. I don't want to put that burden on the taxpayer. That is why I am opposed to this. If we want to study it in a...or opposed to that portion in the amendment but would support Witek's amendment to take it out, I just don't want to bind our citizens with either...with higher health...with higher taxes than they already have. Thank you.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Jensen. Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you. Madam President, fellow senators, I rise to support the Witek amendment perhaps for some different reasons than have been spoken about and I agree with some of the speakers as well. It appears to me that Section 14 is out of place in the bill. It does seem to me like it's fluff and intent language which is suitable perhaps in another bill or in another setting. In the Banking Insurance Committee this year, we did have at least two bills that dealt with providing health insurance for children. We kept one of those bills alive and it's in committee, I think for the purpose of study, and looking at over the interim and I guess I think that's the proper approach if we're going to do something meaningful and I don't know if the purpose of this section is simply to provide some balance in 455 to make us feel a little better about voting for it or what, but that's the only reason I can see for having this language in there. The part of the language that I do object to pretty strenuously is that if it is the intent of the Legislature to do this and if we're going to make this a policy and put the policy in statute with this bill, then why in the world do we shift the responsibility to the Governor to develop