

Senator Jensen is making. We do see a need to save money. We have federal cuts coming we have budget cuts that we have to deal with at the state level. We know that our resources are limited, we must stretch them as far as possible. So obviously we've got to take every dollar that's duplicated and try and eliminate any waste to earn efficiency, that's what this bill is all about. Those savings that then result have to...we have to evaluate the priority use of those. Obviously one use is to balance out the budget and reduce expenditures, that's one. Another would be perhaps if we find...I think we spend too much in the middle, in terms of management, not enough in the front line with the workers out there who are now overwhelmed, in some cases, with far too many cases to deal with. And part of the thing we've seen is not only do you want efficiency, but effectiveness of services, that we have too many families in need out there, where they're 1 of 200 cases for a caseworker, and they just aren't getting the help, and the result is we're not getting the sort of impact we want with families in need. So, perhaps, we want to take a look at how we redirect some monies into that direction. All of that has to be worked through, and all of it needs to take some time to work out. But ultimately the sort of things that Senator Jensen talks about are what we're going to keep in mind. The thing that I have a concern about, Senator Jensen, is some of the specific language and perhaps its impact as we go through the process about not having the state be a primarily direct provider of such services. That one in particular has me concerned because in some cases that is in fact what we need to do, whether it be CPS workers or others, and that is a direct provision of services. So some of those type of things concern me, and that's the reason, if we had more time, I'd be more than willing to work with you to try and achieve some language changes that could be mutually agreeable. But at this point I would have to rise in opposition to the amendment, but not totally to the intent of what's being talked about. And I want to reaffirm, once again, that the idea of trying to have the state government be a partner, that's the whole concept, a partner not only with the agencies involved, but a partner with the communities involved. And that would mean bringing in private and nonprofit resources into the system. What we have found is the state can't do it alone. We are incapable of doing that. The problems that we face with families and children and those in need in our state have to have a partnership with, not only the state and the community, but the private sector in terms of the churches out