

responsibly. There are people in the system who would prefer that no questions be asked. And there are people in the system who think that we are not competent, and maybe in the past we have demonstrated we are not competent, to ask questions. But that is not true. The members of this body have a responsibility to ask those questions and those individuals who make the recommendations for appropriations have a responsibility to answer them and not challenge the integrity and the honesty of those of us who raise the questions. I would like to know and I'm not going to use my time for that purpose of questioning, but no one has stood on this floor and told me when they first learned of the problem at the Pharmacy College. It is absolutely unbelievable to me that this problem was not called to the attention of this body a long time ago and in a more substantial manner. There was some evidence of concern but never was there any indication that the structure would need to be completely rebuilt. As I have said, when this body met a few months ago to discuss the \$47 million structure of a new...major new addition at the medical school, no one mentioned it, not one word, not one tiny hint that there was also a \$3 million problem with the College of Pharmacy. It would seem to me, it would seem to me only appropriate that this issue ought to have been brought before us. Another question that ought to have been raised by the Appropriations Committee and then subsequently by this body was why some of the same people who were involved with the construction of the Pharmacy College were also involved with the construction of the Cushing Stadium at Kearney. I would like to know why. All they say is we have some different people. Ladies and gentlemen, people do not necessarily make the difference, it is the attitude and the intent of the organization and the company and the business that makes the difference. Senator Hannibal has pointed out engineering firms disagree. They rechecked their figures. Might it not have been well advised for those figures to have been rechecked prior to the time the construction began? Is it because it is taxpayers' money and they know full well from the experience of this body that we will repair the blooming thing if it falls down, and that we have a system in place which absolves anyone of responsibility? Ladies and gentlemen, some important names were involved in that construction process. Some very important names were involved in the engineering process. Let it be that Chizek and Wang and Labedz company that built the thing, there would be hell to pay and it would never, ever cease. There would be investigations. There would be alterations. There would be comments. Ladies and gentlemen, do you purchase