

Services makes a plan, reports back to the court. The court says, I don't like that, I think that ought to be different. So then that's kicked back to this independent panel appointed by the Governor and they have a review, a chance for somebody independently to take a look at the circumstance and tell the department yes or no as an ultimate overseer of a second court of appeal, so to speak, of that placement. And they would make that determination and if they agreed with the department, they would go ahead and if they didn't agree, they could overrule it. You can do that. See, they're not overruling the court then, they're...it's an executive branch function and that would be an executive branch oversight review. It's no problem. The confusion that's been brought to Senator Smith's amendment is inappropriate. It just...the amendment wasn't drafted to reflect what I just said but it can be drafted to accomplish that goal. And in so doing, I could support the bill with that concept and it would be, I think, a reasonable effort, a compromise and it also would be constitutional. So that's the intent and direction, I think, we need to go to. We're not ready to do that. We can't draft it in this quick a fashion so I do plan to oppose the bill. But if the bill does get advanced, I hope you realize that the confusion now being raised can be cleared up quite readily and easily on Select File and I would be willing to work with Senator Smith to see that we adopt just such a change to this bill. But at this moment, at this point, the bill in its current form ought not to be advanced. It's in bad shape. It's wrong and I have yet to hear any of the supporters talk about compromise or reasonable effort to reach a constitutional solution to this problem. So I can't feel good about advancing the bill on anybody's word because no word has been given whatsoever to change...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR WESELY: ...anything in this bill. In addition, nobody has talked yet about a provision I thought was going to be amended out of this bill a long time ago, a \$10 million ticket to have juvenile delinquents now under the state and services provided for them. Nobody has even talked about that part of the bill. A tremendous change in status for these individuals now in the judicial system under this bill moved into the executive branch and a responsibility of our state, a very expensive change, very dramatic change, one we haven't thought through whatsoever and ought not to be advanced. So, for that part of the bill to continue on is a tremendous mistake, in