

Health in reviewing developed or purchased materials assuring that the materials are objective, nonjudgmental and are designed to convey only accurate scientific information and the committee will meet four times per year. I don't see any of that in this bill to go with this scientific review committee. Also, we approved a community health nurse III to reserve available full-time for 60 days and 17 percent of the time for 10 months with a support staff secretary. That was 12,608 dollars. I don't see a community health nurse in here. Maybe I'm missing it and you can point it out to me where that would be. Also, we approved 5,000 dollars to consult through research agencies in the state to provide the Department of Health with a list of agencies, services provided, telephone numbers and addresses, and we approved 20,000 dollars for a toll-free, 24-hour per day contract with an existing facility that provides 24 hour phone coverage. So we already approved in 110A the 24-hour phone line. We approved consultation with an OB-GYN or 5,000 dollars. We approved a scientific review committee, which I don't see under this section, and we approved a community health nurse, which I also don't see under this section, to get this material together. So anyone that voted for 110A could certainly not be against giving information, which is what we've said all along is what we want to do. So it's not the argument that who wants to give information and who doesn't, even though some people might be trying to frame that into what the argument is here. I see the argument as if legitimately this is what you wanted and this is what you say you want today, then why do we need all this new language because we already approved the 24-hour phone line, we already approved the nurse, we already approved the OB-GYN medical consult and yet we have to come in several days or a week later, however long it is, with all new language to approve all these things that we've already approved but in somebody else's language. If there's something in 110 that you specifically do not agree with and think can improve the bill, if there is something in the fiscal note that has already been approved that you do not agree with or would like to improve upon, then I say go at it, amend 110, but to go ahead and make an amendment that...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR WITEK: ...strikes this language, that puts in all new language, that strikes some of the language that has already, as Senator Lindsay said, has been agreed upon I think is the wrong way to go to make changes in this bill. If you would sincerely