

SENATOR JENSEN: You have no idea.

SENATOR ROBINSON: No. I could find out for you, but I don't have it with me right now.

SENATOR JENSEN: Getting back to Game and Parks, are the buildings that they are taking care of, is there a problem with the maintenance and care of those buildings that requires somebody else to take over that position?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Well, I'm not sure there's a problem as far as the discussion in the committee hearing. Of course, like I said, the Game and Parks didn't even testify but I think it was for reducing costs, using people, labor more efficiently where there are multiple agencies in different places, in different cities and so forth. And I think that's why the committee was positive towards the bill. Now whether I can say that for...whether that would...where you'd be more efficient with the state Game and Parks, I don't know, but there is always that possibility that there are some efficiencies that could be brought about by this.

SENATOR JENSEN: Well, I...

SENATOR ROBINSON: Of course, you know, a lot of agencies just don't want to be touched by anyone else too, so I think there's a good possibility there could be some things utilized.

SENATOR JENSEN: Well, that's probably true. I'm not sure that bigger is sometimes better, however, and particularly when I see an entity of government that I think is being run somewhat efficiently and then to bring in another layer on top of that, I have some concern about that. Also Game and Parks receives approximately, in gifts, close to a million dollars a year and these gifts, many of them are specified and they go to certain areas or to certain particular areas of interest. How are those to be handled?

SENATOR ROBINSON: Well, if they weren't federal funds, they would be included in this. If the monies would go to maintenance or whether they'd go to a...for a new building or additions and so forth, that would be...they would be included under this.