

So although I vote to kill the bill, I would vote to raise it with the understanding that a worthwhile workable bill will be brought forth and that it will be supported all the way across the board. If you could have sat in on some of the hearings that we had and hear an individual walk in there one day and make statements very strongly in one direction, then turn around and make almost the opposite statements the next time you heard from him, you would think that he was sober the first time and drunk the next time or drunk the first time and sober the second time. But at any rate, there were so much confusion that I think that what the body is going to have to do is take a position and determine what we think ought to be done with a program like this and forget the outside experts, unless each man who listens to an outside expert feels that what that expert says makes sense.

PRESIDENT: Senator Nore you are next to speak, but I wonder if you would yield the floor to Senator Maresh who has not talked on the issue yet? Would you yield please? Thank you. Senator Maresh?

SENATOR MARESH: Mr. President and members of the Legislature. I would like to ask a question of Senator DeCamp?

PRESIDENT: Senator DeCamp yield?

SENATOR MARESH: Senator DeCamp, you more or less carried the ball on this bill, could you tell us what the amended version does compared to the original bill and what was brought out in the second hearing, I don't have a report on the second hearing in my book. Could you explain what was said at the second hearing and what we oppose this and who supported it and what this present version does?

PRESIDENT: He directed his question to Senator DeCamp, do you want to answer it or do you want to defer his question?

SENATOR DEKAMP: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, that is a very difficult question but I will give a summary, very briefly, there is an old saying that if you give a man a meal, a free meal, you will feed him for one day. Whereas if you can give a man a job, you will feed him for a lifetime. The bills and the amendments range from one end to the other. The one end, the theory is, take the man irrespective of his first personal feelings and opinion and cure him, and there seems to be a lot of questions as to whether this is possible. The other end of the spectrum is the philosophy embodied in at least some of the amendments that possibly you can set up the programs and the centers so that those who do have a serious interest in curing their problem will have the facilities available to do it, and with that summary, those are the two limits of the bill you might say. I tend to go towards the one which sets up programs and possibilities for cure but doesn't expend a tremendous amount of money trying to force a cure on somebody who doesn't really care or want it.

PRESIDENT: Senator Duis?

SENATOR DUIS: Mr. President, I want to ask a question of anyone that can answer it, either Senator Luedtke or Senator DeCamp. I think that one of my concerns in this bill is whether or not the Governor's advisory committee on alcoholism, will have enough input in this legislation or whether we are going to have to depend on someone else such as the expert that was apparently made the head of two different groups at one time, and we finally got him down to one. Dr. Anderson. Now would somebody advise me of whether or not this Governor's advisory committee is going to have any input because I think this is very, very necessary