

voting confidence in the research programs that are started there to keep it ongoing and to take care of this liability that we now share, the Legislature itself, by addressing this issue and realizing we have a problem, are accepting some of that liability if something happens. And I think we have no choice but to go ahead and make the repairs at the earliest possible date if we want to keep the Pharmacy College at the University Medical Center. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT PRESIDING

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Ashford. Senator Ashford, on the Hall amendment. Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the body, first of all, as far as what Senator Elmer said has absolutely nothing to do with whether you like a pharmacy school or whether you don't. It happens to be, pharmacy school happens to be what is housed in that building. It could be any other project. What we're interested in is the brick and mortar issue, whether \$2.8 million of taxpayers' money needs to be spent on this particular brick and mortar issue and I think it's clouding the issue to bring up whether or not you support a pharmacy school or whether you don't. That issue was decided by the Board of Regents three or four years ago. It's a done issue. I think what Senator Hall has done, and I've signed onto this amendment so it is our amendment, has done is brought you what is a good middle ground amendment. I'm not going to use the word "compromise" because it wasn't sat down and worked out with the university people. We, I think, on this one are taking a rather strange viewpoint and that is that maybe the Legislature ought to make a decision on how tax dollars are spent and that's what...that's what Senator Hall is doing. It makes a considerable difference. This is not, for the benefit of Senator Elmer and Senator Wehrbein, just a redrafting of the old amendment. There is a considerable difference here. The old amendment probably was flawed, from hearing the discussion this morning, because it would delay the project for a full year. We'd have to...and then we would have to... and if the results were negative, if the results were, yes, we do need to do the work, it would have been at least a one-year, maybe two-year delay. Taking awareness of that fact in a good faith attempt to resolve the issue, what Senator Hall and I are doing is saying, let's empower our Executive Board, our Executive