

March 24, 1982

LB 761

the body and should point out this problem, and it is a great tourist attraction. And I am in full support of Morrill Hall but I would like to say that I am sure that if the Board of Regents looked around somewhere in central administration or in some other funds up there that they could find \$20,000 to have this study, and I would like to ask the body that let's don't start \$20,000 here and \$20,000 there and \$50,000 here because those little drops in the bucket add up to millions of dollars and which we ain't got. So I am in favor of Morrill Hall. I think it is a wonderful thing, but I would like to ask the body to let the Board of Regents find the mere \$20,000 to start the study and then when they come back, if the study shows that it is bad, quite possibly I would help them lead the forces to get the money when the economy improves and even if doesn't improve to help Morrill Hall. So I ask you to oppose the amendment for the \$20,000. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Before we go on to the next speaker, the Chair would like to introduce some 42 eighth graders from Christ the King School in Omaha. They are over here in the east balcony or straight ahead here, with teachers, Mr. Boldt, Mrs. Post and Mrs. Knobbe. Would they kind of indicate to us where they are, and welcome to your Unicameral Legislature. Back in the east balcony. The Chair recognizes Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I would just...the comment that this dollar amount for the program statement was included in the appropriation recommendations three or four weeks ago and then when the revenue problems developed we essentially went back and took out all of the planning funds that related to the capital construction not on the basis that they were not desirable projects but for the simple reason as I will probably say many times for the simple reason that because of the situation of receipts and the probable fact that we will be in an equally difficult position next year that it is premature to develop plans for funding of projects that probably will never have money in the next 24 months, and so again it is one of those...the need is there, the logic of doing it is there, but because of the economy and the problems of the budget we did not recommend it. I would point out that the bill that was introduced was at one time killed in the committee but that was at the time when we had the \$20,000 in the capital construction budget and when we took it out we reconsidered the indefinite postponing of Senator Wesely's, Remmer's and Rumery's bill and it is still pending in the committee,