

the Touche-Ross report, as pointed out in the budget document, that will be used by the Department of Institutions to provide its budget request was, in fact, designed for institutions, but yet when it was introduced the Department of Institutions said it did not apply. I'll say that again, in case you didn't hear me. They said it did not apply. Why would it apply now in our budget document, 722, for this next year's budget appropriations and considerations? So all my motion does simply is not involve money, and it won't cost the institutions or the community programs any more money because, as I pointed out, the only difference is in the buildings and the facilities, everything else remains the same. If they need a doctor, they contract for services for individual cases whenever they need it, or they have physicians or professionals on staff. Almost all of the intermediate care people are all provided with services by paraprofessionals, so there really is no difference. It gives us more tools, gives us a lot more understanding, and I think if it were provided, it would make our hearings, most importantly our hearings this summer even that much more meaningful. So I would ask you to support this simple amendment. All it does is simply add that both the ICFMRs, the institutions and the community based programs would provide two budgets, one based on one Touche-Ross report of '83, and the other in '84. It seems to make sense. Don't be afraid of it. It won't hurt anything. It will simply make us and help us do a much better job of understanding what costs really are as it applies to MR programs in particular. I hope you would support this.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Warner, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I guess I don't have a lot of real objection if you adopt the amendment. But I do not concur that the two types of facilities can be run in the same model. Adoption of the amendment will mean some additional work for everyone who submits budgets. I, frankly, don't think it will add to resolving the issue. But I understand, for what ever motives, there are those who feel it is compatible. I don't question their sincerity, but neither do I think that the addition of the proposed amendment will add to the effectiveness of the study that we want to do. It will take some more time and effort on the part of the agencies involved or the regions or state operations. But I don't