separate and independent review. And it says primary factors to be considered in the selection of the random sample include but are not limited to age and geographic representation. So in other words we leave in the bill the requirement that says the department will continue to review a random sample and we have, in essence, taken all the people out of that area who do that work. We go on, I mean if we are going to take the employees out and shift them over to the board yet leave a duty and responsibility on the department to do these random sample reviews, what is that going to require of the department? And the issue of the amendment that deals with the reduction from five to four employees, from ten to eight over the two year period that it's phased in tries to address that and tries to ask that question and hopefully get an answer to it. We may have to have an amendment that maybe we just add the employees in that the department will need with regard to subsection (7) of Section 2 as required under the bill, I don't know. And that's one of the problems, I guess, with dealing with this proposal the way we have to, because I guess it was not addressed for purposes of clearly not this amendment in committee, because it was only introduced to us today on the floor, but it was not addressed through the committee process in terms of working through some of these problems that are now showing up in the form of amendment, at least are trying to be addressed, questions asked, hopefully answered. But to date, at least for my purposes, they haven't been answered adequately. And I would ask that we spell out just what the requirements are on the part of the Department of Social Services when we ask them to continue to do these random reviews, what is required, what type of employee (inaudible),...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...what type of financial resources are required by the department, and none of that is addressed in this proposal, but yet we tend to argue that somehow with the transfer of these employees no duty continues to lie with the Department of Social Services, and I would argue that that is absolutely false. There's also completely the whole other issue of who's going to be fiscally responsible for noncompliance with federal government regulations in this area and, ladies and gentlemen, it's clearly going to be the state. Even though it's spelled out that somehow it's going to fall to the State Foster Care Review Board, they in effect are us. And to just spell that out and somehow say that those sanctions are probably not