

buildings including the fiscal staff that worked on this particular bill have a misunderstanding about what artwork is. If you considered all of the artwork in this building including the beautiful stone, terrazzo, columns, and everything, you may have up to fifty percent of the cost of this building that could be determined as artwork. For example, the Kearney State College, the fiscal note says that they have applied \$38,000 for artwork and that it could reduce the budget \$50,880. It is not my intention to reduce that any amount at all. If that is what it takes, that is fine with me. My only contention is I don't want to say to people you have to spend a certain amount for anything. The architects are a hundred percent against this bill. Why? Because they get their percentage of every bit of artwork that we spend money for. If we are going to have a one percent, let's let the Arts Council decide what the works of art are, perfectly all right. Of course the architects don't want this bill. They lose out on whatever their percentage is, seven percent, eight percent, I don't know, ten percent, five percent, whatever they charge. So it is very understandable that they would be opposed to this bill. Now what do you want to spend your artwork for? The original bill said that all boards, agencies, commissions, or departments of state government shall do this. This bill simply says you may do it anyway, you can spend any amount you want to, anything you want you may without the old bill. With the new bill you can still do anything you want. I am not trying to cut down. I am just saying that in buildings, such as, perhaps you may want to go to your constituents and say, "Yes, I am for spending \$140,000 for artwork in the new prison up in Omaha". Now that might be good. I don't know. Maybe prisoners enjoy artwork. If it can be constructed so they can't get to it and deface it, I may be for it myself. I just simply think it makes good sense to say to those planning buildings, spend whatever you want for artwork but don't say you must spend it for artwork. I approve of artwork. Again I must reiterate I am not trying to thwart the artists. I know they are having a tough time. I want them to sell all of the products they can. My wife and I personally have bought more than our share and I even have a couple of works of art of Senator Chambers, and some of you may not even know that he does artwork and he does a beautiful job. But my whole stance here is not against art. It is simply that we have mandated that you must spend money for a certain thing. It would make just as much sense to say you must spend fifteen percent for architects fees, you must spend this for that, you must spend so much for the plumbing. It makes just as much sense. I simply think that by adopting 657 you would relieve the pressure on art and I don't think that