

in terms of the system of heating and cooling. That also included weatherization and installation. I think for us to place this building in this position is not good planning. I know that the Appropriation Committee will probably argue against this. But I believe once we spend the planning money and we find that there is indeed a justification for it that for us to delay it and add to our woes in terms of expenditure money as it relates to the facility and its heating and cooling is not in the best interest of tax payers. What I am proposing to do is place back into the budget the \$500,000 the Governor had requested to remodel the 10th and South headquarters for the Department of Public Institutions which serves the Division of Rehabilitation Services for the visually impaired. I submit to you that if we lay this over that inflation will again take its heavy toll and we will then be in the position of having spend additional money and I submit to you that right now is the time to get at it and to perform this function. Renovate it, put it in a position where it can indeed be efficiently heated and air conditioned and in addition to this there is a part of this facility that can be used by other agencies of government for various agencies. Again if you want to look at cost effectiveness as the space goes up years ahead for other agencies of government this could be used by certain agencies and minimize our cost in that relationship. I ask for the adoption of this amendment to add \$500,000 to restore the Governor's proposal for the purpose of renovating this facility the old Orthopedic Hospital for the Department of Public Institutions and a Division of Rehabilitation Services for the visually impaired.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature I rise to oppose the amendment. Two things I'll say, I suppose I'll say more than once this afternoon, obviously and capital construction that would be done now or done last year would be cheaper if you look at inflation. I suppose I could make that comment for all 35, 40 million capital construction that was before us in a variety of requests from a number of institutions. The overriding thing though that the Appropriations Committee is recommending on capital construction was that none would be done this year of any major building. The emphasis with limited revenue should be for operations as a priority for capital construction and that was the policy carried out throughout by the committee. This project specifically however from the planning money that was appropriated last year also carried some renovation funds which was another \$715,088.