

groundbreaking that it really is, but it is pretty groundbreaking, at least in my experience. Senator Wesely is saying this, maybe there is good policy, if so, let's see if it is true, let's see if there's savings, let's see if these services can, in fact, be moved some place else. Not an onerous standard, not a standard that the Department of Health and Human Services hasn't had a chance to give some input, acknowledgment, and can accept this language. It doesn't stop us from closing the facility. All it says is prove up, make sure that the intended consequences are the consequences that we are really going to get. And isn't that fair? Isn't that what we do in performance review, after a program is over, when we ask, did we get what we spent our money for? And in this case the question is, do we get the savings we contemplate? Isn't that a fair question to ask? Seems fair to me. What I'd suggest that you do is this, Senator Wesely I think has offered us a rather good way out of this problem, saying all right, if this is the number one priority, and if you can prove it, then go ahead and shut it down. But the allegation that it's the number one priority isn't enough when kids futures are at stake. You got to go at least through the hoop of testing the waters, checking it out, running the numbers, making some plans, and seeing to it that this is, in fact, the place where you're going to save money. Now, I think the target...you may want to change it. Maybe there is some language in here you don't particularly like and you're going to move it around. I agree, it's four forty-three, and if we get pressed into choosing one way or the other right now, maybe it will go down. But the concept that says from a senator whose having a program shut down in his district, say to the body, I will accept it, if you can show us the savings, is a pretty darn good precedent. It's a precedent that we all ought to be willing to own up to when our time comes, and our times will be coming. And that's not a bad standard for any of us to meet. I would not throw this away and say, basically, what we want is total administrative discretion to close at will. We're unwilling, or unable, or lack the desire to test out our assumptions and to study the question first, and to allow us to make a reasoned decision. By the way, there isn't an interim study. This isn't a delay. This doesn't say put it off for a year. It doesn't do those normal legislative sidesteps, it's not in here. It says, develop this body of understanding and you can proceed. It's only intent language, by the way. But the intent, I think, is quite a reasonable one, quite a fair one. And I would suggest this, it's four forty-five in the afternoon, I'd suggest that we move to adjourn, and that if