

that doesn't mean that when time comes to vote I can't be persuaded by Senator Elmer or Senator Schrock or Senator Dierks. But I am hoping that there will be 30 votes to adopt this motion.

**PRESIDENT ROBAK:** Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Warner. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

**SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS:** Senator Chambers, I want to make sure that I'm clear on what your motion is as well. I believe your motion is simply to strike that Curtis from the package, but would I be also correct in...and this is a question, Senator Chambers, would I be correct in assuming that if your amendment had 30 votes and was agreed to, that that would, in fact, be a decision on Curtis not to fund it? And then the second corollary...the second corollary is that would another person be able to offer? And your argument is that, no, your motion is simply to strike it out, not to fund it, I mean, strike it out, period, it's not a question of whether we're going to fund it. Senator Elmer or someone else would have to then file an independent motion on its own. Is that...do I have that correct? Okay. I'm not sure I agree with you on if you offer the amendment that deletes a portion. I'm not sure that if Senator Elmer offered then the amendment again that someone would be able to say that's the same discussion on...at the same level of debate if you may say. I'm not sure about that. I'm going to have to contemplate on that. But, in the meantime, I did want to make one comment on Curtis and that is when the Governor made his veto of 25,000 one of the things that went into his thinking...and I don't criticize him for this at all, was that there was not...the dean was not hired yet and if I remember reading the veto message, it had a statement in there that said, since they don't have the dean yet, there's no reason for the money at this point because they can't go on until they get the dean hired. Since that time, the dean has been hired and the situation has changed. I'm not...I don't know, I haven't asked the Governor whether he would have vetoed it knowing the dean was going to be hired or not, but my sense is the argument went away. The argument went away that since now they have a dean they can use the money for the planning that they need to do for the institution at Curtis. So it's because of that I will be supporting not the Chambers amendment per se because I'm still interpreting that as a negative vote on Curtis, unless I can be convinced differently by Senator Chambers at a later time, but I am going to be supporting in one