

made an interesting observation about a minority report and she said that in the courts this occurs but that minority does not overrule the court. In the court system, they call that a dissent and on some of the most profound and significant points of law, especially those related to personal rights, the dissent of many years ago has since then become the majority opinion which has protected a lot of very essential rights, which if they were challenged now as they were in the early days, people would not be able to understand how such a challenge could be made by a rational person. So the mere fact that a greater number said they are on this side of the issue does not mean that they are right. We don't know what forces came to bear on them that caused them to take that position. So you should look at the reasoning contained in either or both positions. And in this instance, as in others when we have debated this bill and others, I get the feeling that people in rural areas can be given less than what is offered in the urban areas. Somebody who may endanger the sight, not only of those of us who have been around the track a long time, a lot of times, and may think we have seen everything there is to see, but children, who are not in a position to make a judgment and a decision for themselves, will be subjected to the operations of those who will gain this increased authority under this bill. I think the amendment that Senator Hoagland is offering is valid. We do have an obligation to do what we think is best for the citizens. The social contract was based on the notion that certain groups come together and send aspects of their freedom to move as they would as individuals to the group in order that the group would be strong enough to do and have the means to do for everybody what they as individuals cannot do for themselves, and that is the underlying theory of government. A theory such as that is what gives justification for governments to do the things that they do and exercise the powers that they exercise. So in this instance, I think the Legislature has an obligation to stand between the public's welfare and these types of powers that 131 is attempting to place in the hands of people who I don't feel should have them. Senator Hoagland's motion is not to kill this bad bill as it ought to be killed, but simply to take away from these individuals called optometrists the right and the authorization to use certain specified drugs and types of drugs in treatment of eye disorders. I am supporting his amendment and I hope enough others will to adopt it.