

of the bill, and Senator Cope who is familiar with the bill, to the Murphy amendment is that we feel that there should be a little flexibility that state funds be used for like setting up the art displays, whether it's here or at a University or wherever, and also that this position of curator, which is a faculty person at Kearney State College, be able to be funded. The third objection is that in order to get federal funds sometimes you do have to provide state match, and so this is to get what I think is the heart of Senator Murphy's concern and that is that state tax dollars be used to actually purchase or acquire art and yet this would not tie the hands of this program so that the art couldn't be displayed, or to prevent the use of federal funds. It is not devious at all. It's very up-front I think, and I would move this amendment to Senator Murphy's amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is on the Fowler amendment to the Murphy amendment to LB 116. Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY: Well, gentlemen, this is more or less precisely the intent of my initial amendment. We have the federal government thinking up programs and deciding that they were swell ideas but they don't want to fund them any more and the state should, and we've already absorbed two or three of those in this session. Now we have a private sector who likes the concept of art and bless them, they went about it in a responsible manner. They raised funds. They did what they wished to do. They borrowed a little bit on the state's funds and personnel in the curator at Kearney, and I guess I wouldn't fault that too much, hoping that it's a worthwhile project, but now we are going to come to the state and say, we have started a real good thing here, the only thing is we've run out of gas, we'd like to continue the project, but we can't justify it enough for those who started it to continue to fund it, so why doesn't the state step in and fund it? I'm sorry, but I cannot buy that concept. I think that's the precise manner in which this state has gotten involved in far too many projects, and I don't wish to see us get involved in another. I cannot accept Senator Fowler's motion inasmuch as it goes right back to state funding of this concept, and that's what I'm objecting to. So I would ask that the Fowler amendment be rejected and that my amendment stating that state funds shall not be used to finance a project that was initiated by private people in a private sector. Let's not absorb or adopt another program to be funded with taxes that we must first take from our fellow constituents. I would object to