

why I'm suggesting maybe we don't need the amendment. We're going to head in largely this direction anyway and...

SENATOR VRTISKA: Well, I'm sure nobody would disagree that we don't want to cut services so drastically that people will end up suffering. But at the same time my goal, and I'm sure it is many of us on the floor's goal is to be able to provide those services in a much...as much...as much effective way as we do now, but without...by reducing some of the duplication we can do it at a less cost. If we can accomplish that, and you...it's your opinion you can do that without having this amendment, or you haven't really studied the amendment...

SENATOR WESELY: Oh, (inaudible).

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR WESELY: Senator Vrtiska, absolutely, that's where we got started in all of this. We simply can't have the waste and costs involved, faced with the federal cuts and with the need that we have in the state to balance out the budget, and so obviously that's the number one goal, where can we save some money. We can't afford some of these things, so....

SENATOR VRTISKA: Well, of course, that's...that's an easy answer that we want to save costs. The question is, how? And I guess that's what we're...that's the issue we're sort of, more or less, debating on many sides. And so I'm going to continue to watch carefully what happens. And I, too, have not had a real close look at this amendment, and I would like to have an opportunity to study it a little bit more. But I think maybe it's something that we might have to look at if, in fact, we...in order to get something on track that we know is actually happening.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator. Senator Witek.

SENATOR WITEK: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. I rise in support of the Jensen amendment. And I appreciate the opportunity to talk about some of these concepts before this