

goal if we move to a block grant to make sure that we are going to have a new system that works and that gets more of the resources delivered to the students than...instead of to administration and to the people filing papers and to all the other secondary places that the money tends to go at times. But again, the language that is here includes all of the various concerns that have been brought up. I believe it's important to keep those in the bill some place, but certainly I think that it can be looked over and worked through and clarified in terms of determining which agency or commission is responsible for these various concepts and then how we know in fact that they are going to be related to the block grant approach once we begin that in '97. Thank you.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Senator McKenzie. We now turn to Senator Bernard-Stevens on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Wesely, members of the body, again, briefly I concur with Senator McKenzie that I'm not supportive of taking this particular section out, but there are some details that we may be able to work on between now and Select that may be a better way of doing it. But one of the things I'm very comfortable of doing at this stage at least is in this particular section it does specifically, as Senator Chambers points out, points to a lot of areas that are going to be very difficult decisions and some that may in fact be very controversial decisions. And I think that's...Senator McKenzie and I and Senator Bromm have wanted to be as up front as possible, trying not to hide anything, not trying to slide anything through but say, look, here are some of the issues. The fact...the issues that we've identified is probably the most crucial and possibly the most controversial that we want to make sure that they look at. Do we need to list these? No, probably not. Is it good I think to at least in the beginning to list so that people are aware? Yeah, I think it is. And it does make some of the people a little bit more comfortable if some of the areas that they're concerned with is specifically mentioned as one that should be looked at. Does that mean that even if they're listed they will be looked at in a way that the senators would particularly like? No, not necessarily. If we don't have the intent in here, does that mean that they won't look at all these areas anyway? Probably...no, it doesn't mean that either. But at this stage of the debate I think it is good to put these things forward, to put what the intent is and all the areas that need to be looked at and I'm comfortable in keeping this section