

whole business, and I think it is dawning on all of you now exactly all these things that are being required, and 95 percent of what is in that bill is required. It is dawning on you now what is being forced upon us and you are feeling some frustration. But 95 percent of what is in that bill is required. Now Senator Chambers doesn't like any of the bill and he stands up here and grossly exaggerates the effects of the bill, in my opinion, and he concentrates on one little narrow area and gets you to think about that and ignores the whole bill, but he doesn't like the whole bill. Now you can concentrate on the Attorney General versus Social Services and we can get back into a philosophic argument on that and that is fine and that is appropriate, but to stand up here and everybody start suggesting that the bill as a whole is a failure and that particular provision is without reason seems to me to be a little ridiculous. Now if you want attorneys and every agency in state government mushrooming into legal departments, you can do that. That is what is happening in Social Services right now. If you don't like empire building in government, take a look at Social Services budget and take a look at their building legal department. The question is, do you want the legal department with the lawyers, with the people who are trained to do it, with the Attorney General who has a whole...whose whole function is to prosecute or do you want a legal department in Social Services and another big one in the Department of Roads and a whole bunch of big legal departments all around? I suggest to you, and that was the only suggestion we made yesterday, that it makes more sense for the Attorney General to be doing it. It just makes more sense in a whole number of ways, and I would be glad to argue that again if we want to get back into it. But excising the amendment, as Senator Higgins has suggested, is not going to be all that easy because the amendment we adopted last time had to do with things other than the Attorney General's Office. It also had to do with the provision that Senator Johnson did not like and which you cut out of the bill last time having to do with liens. We are going to get back into a discussion on several different issues here. We have next year, if it turns out you don't like the philosophy of having the Attorney General do it, fine, you can change that next year. The implementation date is being put off but I don't think it is going to behoove us to get...in trying to get back into a discussion of the different aspects of this bill, many of which I don't like myself but most of which are required by the federal