

where the same time next year they're going to be left hanging out there without enough money. So that is the point that I wanted to make by way of this motion and before I withdraw it I'll see if there's anybody else who would like to address what I have brought before us.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes, Madam Speaker, members, I just want to simply say two things. Senator Chambers is somewhat right in making the analogy he is. One of the things that we do regularly on many agencies is restrict the amount of money that they can spend, either General Fund, maybe federal funds, we've got some of that, or in this case, cash authority to get a handle on what we want to look at, in this case the SOS issue. We have determined next year we want that program to run at this level. If there is a need to make a change we can respond accordingly next session and I would say even if it had to be April 1, normally we'd be out of session nearly by that time. There is time to do that if it was in fact to be increased or what we are tending now is to have it responsibly served, whichever that is. I don't want to make a foregone conclusion on this issue, but we do need some way to demand a response to that, in this case the SOS, so we are saying you will operate the agency next year at the same level it is this year until we get a chance to look at it carefully, until we are convinced there is a need for expansion or perhaps even a retraction, a contraction whatever that is to do. But there is ample authority for them to operate through our next session when the Appropriations Committee can review this after having the study this summer and fall. So I think this is a proper way to go at it. It simply continues to provide us leverage so that we understand that and so that they understand that we are looking over their shoulder. I'm not saying that they don't understand that, they do at this point. But it's simply a way for us to keep our fingers in the pot until we see a satisfactory solution that will be worked out. And so that is the reason for keeping it flat next year. It may well increase, as Senator Chambers says, I don't know. But it might go the other way. We might decide that we want to keep it like it is based on the study and the use of...the proper use of temporaries as determined by us and eventually this body. The other thing I would like to say that the E clause is very critical to this. If we do not get the 33 votes we just simply don't need the bill. So I'd like to