

same questions that Senator Koch and Senator Cope raised, and like to suggest to Senator Murphy maybe some alternative language to look at. If his concern is the use of state funds for the purchase of art works, I think it would be best if, in fact, that he indicate something to that effect. Senator Koch has raised some questions about display costs, for example, if an exhibit is set up in the State Capitol from this collection, would this language preclude the use of employees of the Capitol from working and watching this collection? Also the bill provides for a curator person to kind of monitor the collection at Kearney State College. Currently that position exists. Currently that person is on the faculty, and in all honesty probably some of the state dollars are going to pay his time to catalogue the collection, to research Nebraska artists, and so on. Now if the concern is the purchase of art, then I think perhaps Senator Murphy could draft an amendment that would say, no state general funds shall be used for the purpose of art, for the purchase of art. However, I would make the point Senator Cope does that State Arts Council money must be matched by state dollars to get the federal dollars, so that essentially there becomes state dollars tied to that. I think the Arts Council would be one way to provide support for this project, and I think what Senator Murphy's amendment does indirectly is preclude Arts Council support for the project. So perhaps Senator Murphy might just want to say something that state funds could not be used for the purchase of art unless those state funds are part of a required federal match. Now that sort of language, you know, I would not have major problems with, but as it is now I think it's too broad to preclude as Senator Koch says the ability of government, whether it's the State Capitol, or the University or whatever, from being able to take advantage of this collection, and it also I think precludes the ability of Kearney State College staff from serving as a curator, and so on. But if the purchase of art is a major concern, then I think perhaps Senator Murphy might try and address that in a more specified amendment. As it is right now I could not support Senator Murphy's amendment. I believe it's too broad and a little too vague.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. President and colleagues, I rise in opposition of Senator Murphy's amendment. Essentially what this is is giving flexibility to set up the State Arts Bank out at Kearney State College. I think this flexibility is good and I think you can tie too closely, tie down too closely by statute that precludes this from any