

than to let the schools use facilities that they have there that are presently unoccupied. They have some buildings, specifically the school for the deaf, that aren't being used, that they can't...they've had...they've been approached to rent them by programs so that they can use them because they're good facilities that currently the population doesn't require that they be used. They're being maintained. Cost is being incurred on the part of the programs. All this amendment does is allow them to go about the business, if they make the decision to, to rent those facilities so that resources will come in in terms of rent that currently isn't being generated. I think it makes good sense. It is not an issue of trying to protect bricks and mortar. I would argue that if the concern is there that at some point down the road this could prove to be a hurdle that would have to be overcome in the future, then what is the real intent of this type of legislation? Is it really just to do nothing more than to tear down those bricks and mortar? I think that all we do here is allow for the interim, whether the interim be a point in the future that is when a, I guess, a study is completed, I would guess from some of the comments that at the point in time that that study is completed that there would no longer be a need or my concern would be is there no longer a need for these facilities. Is that the concern at that point that, I guess, the sunset provision would...would raise its head. I don't think anybody would contract. I don't know of any...I'm sure there are some long-term contracts with the state but if the introducers would prefer that this be on a year-to-year basis type of operation so that there is a feeling on their part that this is not intended to scuttle any kind of study that is going to be done, it would not be my intent to do that but yet probably the opposite to work to be an active part of that proposal to take a look at what role these residential facilities are going to play in the future, if any, in the education of students that happen to need these types of programs. All we do with this amendment is, in the interim, allow them at the site level to offset some of their costs. They're currently maintaining these buildings. I think it just...it's a good business transaction to say if there is a program out there that would like to rent these facilities so you can generate a little money, it makes sense for the state to allow that to happen. Currently, these programs don't have the statutory authority to do that. All Senator Wehrbein's amendment and mine does is allow for that to take place if it's a good business decision. If it is not, if there are no takers, it won't happen. And I guess I would argue what is wrong with