

March 17, 1981

LB 245

spending a million and a half or a million, three, rather, to get plans ready to go to bid. It is not unusual, I think over the last ten years there must be five, six hundred thousand, maybe more, that we have spent for projects to be developed which never were funded but it is a pretty sizeable amount. I am much more willing to support a new Animal Science Building, an additional one out there, which is not a cheap project, it is six or seven million. I don't think you can do both and I frankly think more students will be served if that is done. I frankly think maybe more research can be done if that facility is constructed if the money is used for that purpose. And the other thing I am concerned about is tying up a series of general funds, it doesn't make any difference, or Nebraska capital construction funds for three or four years. We have one facility we have done that with now, the last five years at least, if not six. We have had several million dollars tied up pending construction for the Omaha medium-minimum facility, corrections facility, which is unable to have been going on, the result of that tying up that money, however. There is a lot of other construction that could have been done, should have been done, of a kind of renovation of buildings that just plain couldn't be. Now that Omaha facility is still involved in lawsuits. It may be tied up for awhile. If we tie up here seven or eight million that may not occur for two or three years, it merely means that these other facilities that need renovation are not going to go forward either and I guess I would urge the body to support Senator Vickers' amendment because I don't see where that stops the ability of a vet college to be constructed. What it does say is that we are going to look at it for another year and a half or two and then recognize that the package that is proposed is not possible and then move on to something else. I think it is a reasonable proposal and I hope the body would accept it

SENATOR CLARK: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I am going to oppose the amendment, at least at this time, and my opposition is based upon the very reason in a way that Senator Warner is supporting it. He says it postpones for a year and a half or two years making a final decision, facing up so to speak. Maybe what he is suggesting occur in a year and a half or two years is what we maybe ought to decide now. We go direction A or direction B and so I oppose the amendment on the grounds that it delays and prolongs the decision when I think it is the year to make it. At the same time I recognize inherent in the amendment is the proposal, an alternate proposal, and maybe an acceptable proposal in some form or other of intensified research. I also question, peripherally at least, the constitutionality, at least as the way it is written. That is not to say it couldn't be redone to be constitutional