

does, that he has spent five years on it, so I would like to say what I have to say and point out some things that I really think need to be addressed before I could vote for the bill, and in that context, perhaps provide some time in which, if they see fit, they can attempt to address those things. But with regard, first of all, to the educational requirements and the licensing standards and the educational standards, by the way, education was not a requirement in the old statute, that is a new requirement, I really think that some standards need to be set out in order to make the bill constitutional. Senator Beyer, you might want to look an opinion, a recent Attorney General's opinion that was pointed out to me by Senator Hartnett, that is on page 1478 of our Journal, has to do with some language in a bill that Senator Hartnett had some experience with that says to establish the legislative authority was to establish minimum standards for written control procedures and guidelines governing the training functions and qualifications of supportive pharmacy personnel. And that is all we said, and the Attorney General said that wasn't saying enough. And I think if you compare that language to the language in this bill, both with regard to licensing standards and with regard to educational standards, that you, too, would feel that probably some additional guidance is necessary there in order to make the bill constitutional. Secondly, I'd sure like you to take a look at this language that is on page 12, lines 10 and 11, and also page 10, line 10, which has to do with the bonding requirement, and it says that any person injured by the willful, malicious, or, or wrongful act of the license holder or of an employee of the agency acting under the scope of his or her employment, they have a right to bring an action on the bond, but that is old language in the statute but totally unworkable language, in my opinion. It seems to say, for example, that somebody's willful act, even though it is not unlawful, or not even negligent, might be the basis for a suit on a bond, and that would... I guess that would be another thing that it would surely be nice to clean up. That wasn't any...any new oversight on anybody's part. That is some of the existing language. In fact, that whole existing set of statutes, in my opinion, is I would hope something we would not repeat in our modern legislature. Another thing I would ask you to take a look at is the bond amount. It was at \$10,000. It is still at \$10,000. It has been at \$10,000 since 1959. So if our intent is to require the same measure of responsibility today as we required in 1959, it would sure make a lot of sense to at least double that bond, and then maybe then some. I noticed also that you eliminated