

about that, let's find out about that because that's an entirely different problem that needs to be dealt with. But the decisive factor to me was this. Even though this is a state program, I saw very little difference between those households that took into their property taxpaying households that had relatives that were not the children of the property owners or friends that came in to live in the home or parents that adopted children and brought them into a home and went to...and those children then went to the school in that district. I saw very little difference between those children and those families than the family that takes in a, voluntarily takes in a foster care child. And it's a wonderful job that they do and obviously I support the foster care program. I know we all do, but I see very little difference to justify such an expenditure of state aid as this that would justify a stipend for that child. Secondly, as I mentioned before is, is there a dollar for dollar benefit to the individual...to our state by this program? That's the second criteria. Are we getting the bang for our buck out of this program? And I would suggest to you, no, we are not. And the reason for that is that the actual cost of each child in this foster care program or this wards of the court program, in that \$1.7 million category, the cost to educate those children is not \$1.7 million, it's not \$1.7 million. Secondly, I suggest to you that there are, and this gets to the budget side a little bit and that is that there are programs that we put into the budget this year and they've all been mentioned in the last couple of days. The early childhood education, domestic violence, EPSCoR, library automation, many of those programs involve education, involve children but I would suggest to you that they are programs that have a dollar for dollar benefit, that we're going to get our bang for our buck out of those programs and so when we balance those kinds of programs out and we use that dollar for dollar criteria, this program just doesn't come close to meeting that criteria. Thirdly, is the money being spent to further the public...is the money now being spent to further the initial public policy? Now I've already answered that question in answer to number one and that is the third criteria I used. Obviously not. The money being spent on this program does not further the public purpose, albeit, valid, the public purpose that was established by the wards of the court program initially. So for me, the third criteria is not met by this program. The fourth criteria is this. As state legislators after we go through whatever economic criteria we want to use in evaluating a program, we have to use the gut test. Does it