

necessary to proceed. During the years I have been in this body I have been involved in a number of investigative committees and this one is far different than any I have ever been involved with before and it has a much broader range of responsibility than I think any of us realize as it initially started. I would rather candidly say that it would be a mistake to assume that the investigation is primarily or solely focused on foster care children because certainly some of the things that we have seen would not be within that scope nor would those problems come to the attention of proper authorities through that scope. That doesn't lessen the importance of looking at those in foster care, I'm just suggesting that it is broader than just that and you don't want to narrow yourself to that narrow of viewpoint. It has been pointed out by others, which obviously the committee understands, is our role is to review as an oversight capacity how the system function and whether or not changes ought to be made in a variety of areas to be more effective. Unfortunately, as it has, or maybe fortunately, as it has evolved we have found ourselves in a position of having to go out and make investigations independently in order to accurately determine if a variety of agencies had performed as you would have hoped they did. I'm not in a position where I'm going to take a firm position that the whole system broke down because I don't know if that's necessarily true. I have not made that decision yet. Certainly there is sufficient evidence of what we have seen to date, however, that there are aspects of it that for some reason or another were not pursued as far as I think now, based on what we know, could have been or should have been done. And I think it's necessary to proceed to try and substantiate those what may appear to be shortcomings, I think it is necessary to substantiate more clearly than we have whether or not, in fact, that is the case, that there was shortcomings and then why and then come back to this body with the appropriate recommendation, whether it be changes in substantive law, whether it be changes in appropriations, whether it be reallocation of existing appropriations, whether it is establishment of new agencies. I'm not prepared to respond to any of those as a conclusion at this point, but what I am prepared to be fully supportive is the continuation of what we are now doing because I think in the orderly fashion as it has been laid out, that we could come to some conclusions that will be acceptable in this body and can...I would never suggest prevent a reoccurrence from ever happening because I'm sure there is no way you can write a law to prevent unfortunate events from reoccurring. But the chances for those events to go unnoticed or unattended to or ignored