

**SPEAKER BARRETT:** Senator Elmer, please.

**SENATOR ELMER:** Thank you, Mr. President, and members, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I feel that the \$100,000 for this study is unnecessary. Let's be realistic. I think the study would just reaffirm the need to restructure this pharmacy building. The university has fully staffed this college with research people that need to be in their laboratories. They have about a half a million dollars in research grants. If we delay this with this study approximately a year, we will lose considerable amount of that staff and research money. Delay will likely destroy the UN-O Pharmacy College. To answer Senator Schmit's question, if we go ahead with the restructuring, the firm that's responsible for this restructuring would be liable for this building for the next 10 years. I think it would be an unnecessary and destructive delay that would needlessly waste a \$1,000 of the Legislative Council's money very unnecessarily; a \$100,000 that would be thrown away. And I would urge you to vote against this amendment.

**SPEAKER BARRETT:** Thank you. Senator Hannibal, followed by Senators Lamb and Korshoj.

**SENATOR HANNIBAL:** Well, Mr. Speaker and members, I am going to try to address some of the issues that were presented and I'm not sure whether I'm going to oppose the amendment or not. Senator Withem and Senator Hall put forth a very plausible argument and Senator Schmit has also suggested some very reasonable things. I will try to...try to address what Senator Schmit said last, first, and what he asked last was why haven't we asked or demanded that the people responsible be brought to accountability? And that question has been answered. That issue has been settled with the main people involved. And that issue was settled by the Supreme Court. It wasn't because our university and our legal counsels didn't try to go after the main architect, the subcontracting structural engineer, the building contractor. They tried to do that but the Supreme Court said it's too late. And there's a long explanation and I'm comfortable with the explanation and I would be happy to discuss it at length with you as to why that happened but, suffice to say, it has happened. Who is at fault? We don't know. The court never made that determination. We don't know who is at fault. The court said it doesn't make any difference anymore who's at fault, it's too late. The architects maintain