

food in their market basket. There is a reason that the United States is a dominant force in world agriculture, that we're able to stay ahead of declining prices and stay in business. I would suggest to you that the greenhouses, not only on the East Campus but in all of the land grant universities across the nation that do basic agronomical research, are the reason for that. These are not greenhouses in the popular sense of greenhouses, but more classrooms, more research facilities most certainly than they are what we would conceive to be greenhouses. There were statements made that this was the College of Pharmacy at the Institute; that when the 3.5, 3,536,000 was voted out of an appropriation made by the Legislature some 14 years ago that a conscious effort was made on the part of the University to maintain the space with cheaper materials. I would share with you several excerpts from a person that I admire a lot and appreciate a great deal. Dr. Don Hanway, retired from the University a number of years ago. After his retirement, he provided yeoman services to many of the agricultural organizations in Nebraska on a gratis basis. I think we all some place in our file have a letter that Don mailed to us with regard to the quality of construction. He begins his letter: When the East Campus greenhouses in the Plant Science Building were being planned, I was chairman of the planning committee and also Chairman of the Agronomy Department. He goes on to say, that I am not personally aware of any decisions, underlined "any", to go to, quote, "cheaper" route and construction specifications of what was to be built. He says, I personally accepted them, in talking about the specifications for the greenhouses on a trip to Chicago to study new greenhouses and to consult with planners and builders there. I again emphasize that I'm not aware of any decision to include cheap materials to save money. Choice of plastic instead of glass for the roof was discussed with a scientific staff. The particular material consciously chosen seemed to have the promise of excellence in performance and safety and durability. Being relatively new, it had no long record of use. Senator Dierks, Senator Morrissey and myself some weeks past went out to the University. We didn't talk to Central Administration. We didn't talk to the heads of departments. We talked to old gray-bearded fellows, such as myself, that were around when the greenhouses were built and they explained to us what was done and, basically what was done, and it's substantiated by documents dating back to the mid-seventies, that, yes, the expenditures were reduced from 13,536,000 down to the red-lined 10 million dollars. They dug back in the files. August 13, 1975: the laboratory building was