

the state is going to preserve this, the state is going to run this, the state is going to be owning the castle, That is not the intent. The intent is here to have a study to see exactly what can be done to preserve the castle. By not allowing the study, we close the door. We'd be back in here and all we could do next year is regret. This does not commit the state to future funds. This does not commit the state to owning and operating the castle. With regards to the bids that came in, I think we have got to look a little bit closer than just to say we can get 300,000 bucks for that castle, why do they want to let the state operate it or why do they want the county to operate it, or whoever is going to operate it when we can get \$300,000? I would suggest that the criteria for some historic building such as the castle should not be just the amount of money we can get if we try to sell it. Imagine what we could get if we sold the State Capitol here and just moved into some building down the street. I am sure we could do very well by selling this to some private venture. But making money is not always the intent of government, and I think in this case it should not be the intent. Regarding some of the specific bids, if you look down the list that was distributed by Senator Labeledz on the amendment with Senator Haberman, those all call for either commercial development of that property or call for limited or no public access. What these call for, basically, is, hey, we have got a beautiful, historic building located on gorgeous grounds but you guys aren't allowed to see it. The public is not invited. Sorry, guys. It is just not...I just don't think that is the way the state wants to approach it. We have got...sure, we could get the 300,000 for it, assuming, of course, that we ignore what Senator Ashford has already stated and that is that the land and the building is governed by covenants that would restrict the usage, would restrict to who it could be sold to because of the manner in which the property must be used. These bids are merely that. They are bids. They are subject to whether the school board wants to accept them in the first place; number two, and probably more importantly, whether the school board can accept those bids. I don't think these bids should be swaying as far as what we should be doing with this study. As we mentioned, the study opens up the opportunities. It provides information. It does not commit the state to future funding, and I think we would be wise to leave the appropriation as it is. I would urge you to vote against the Haberman-Labeledz amendment.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Ashford, please, followed by