

aesthetically for that building after it is built. That is exactly why the one percent is there up front and I ask you members, is the issue really the economic stress that we are facing? That issue wasn't there during the last great depression when this building was built for and paid for at a time when our nation was facing its worst economic moment. When we are building our public buildings and we find that we are running out of funds, the real issue is not enough funds may have been appropriated to construct the building especially considering the rising costs due to inflation. And so it is very easy to turn to that one percent allocated to the arts when the real issue should be maybe getting another appropriation. I think the real question before this body should be not dispensing with the one percent but asking ourselves seriously, is one percent enough? Thank you, members.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President, several people have commented on both sides that it seems that the last great involvement of public art and public construction was in the last great depression. There have been many programs on television and many articles recently in magazines about the 100th anniversary of Franklin Roosevelt and obviously out of that came a good discussion of the New Deal and one of the things that was stressed was that some of the most important American art was developed in public buildings, including rural post offices, including parks, including facilities around Lincoln, you can see a great deal of public art that was built during the depression. And then public art disappears, and I think it is because of that that I question the statement that we would spend without this bill money on art. Senator Schmit said that he sometimes thinks we would have built a tin shed for a State Office Building. We really built a concrete block house, it was a little more expensive maybe than a tin shed, but you go down there and you walk through that building, recently built, public building, and was there any allocation of that money for art? Was there any aesthetic consideration with that building? The contrast between the State Capitol Building and the State Office Building is amazing in terms of any sort of aesthetic considerations. Now recently there have been efforts to try and put a couple of photographs in borrowing from the Historical Society but nothing has been built into that building, and if you look at all the buildings that have been built since the depression, you would not find that this Legislature once cared about putting money in for art. It was only until this bill was passed and some money allocated that we started seeing a revival of the concern during the