

The UNL Greek system contributes thousands of dollars and volunteer hours to community services. Page 6



Thursday

75/41

Mostly sunny and breezy today. Friday, cloudy and cooler.

Students voice anger at green space forum

By Alan Phelps
Senior Reporter

Students against the construction of a proposed green space vented their anger Wednesday at an open forum in the Nebraska Union.

About one dozen students and faculty members spoke against the plan to convert the parking lot north of the union into a flat, grassy area. Only one student in the crowd of more than 50 stood up in support of the green space.

Some speakers voiced concern about the \$100,000 to \$200,000 cost of the project. Several rejected the idea that the University of Nebraska-Lincoln needed another green space, or complained that moving parking away from campus would be unsafe.

Others just seemed angry about the parking situation in general.

But UNL Interim Business Manager Paul Carlson, on hand to answer questions about the plan, said Chancellor Graham Spanier's mail and phone calls were running about 90 percent in favor of the green space.

"He is listening, but that's what he's been hearing," Carlson said. Spanier also received a petition signed by more than 350 people who wanted the green space, Carlson said.

Spanier was invited to the forum, Carlson said, but could not attend because of scheduling problems.

Doug Oxley, graduate senator in the Association of Students of the University of Nebraska, said it would be impractical to build parks while tight budgets put off more worthy projects, such as renovating Richards Hall.

"This is not the right thing to do at this time," he said.

Chris Peterson, a member of last year's Government Liaison Committee, said UNL could lose respect in the Legislature if it squandered money on green space while other more deserving projects awaited funding.

Carlson said the university was continuing to pursue the capital improvements on its priority list. The money that would be used to tear up parking lot 17A would not go far in repairing Richards Hall, he said.

"That's going to cost millions to fix up Richards Hall," he said. "Millions."

Graduate student Tom Meyers,

See FORUM on 7

Bjorklund motions entered

From Staff Reports

Attorneys for Roger Bjorklund have filed four motions to suppress statements and conversations Bjorklund made while he was in the Lancaster County Jail.

Scott Helvie, Lancaster County chief public defender, filed motions Tuesday to prevent the use of statements Bjorklund made to Scott Barney and three correctional officers.

Bjorklund and Barney both are charged with first-degree murder in the death of University of Nebraska-Lincoln student Candice Harms.

In the motions, Helvie said:

Bjorklund was held in the Lancaster County Jail from December 1992 to January 1993, which was a violation of his rights under the Fourth and 14th amendments. During that time, Lancaster County correctional officers Vicky Thompson, Susan Briggs

and Bradley Johnson overheard statements Bjorklund made.

The conversations were intercepted through the use of an electronic device, which was not authorized by the court. The statements should be suppressed as evidence from Bjorklund's trial.

Statements Bjorklund made to Barney were not voluntary, and admitting those statements into evidence would be a violation of Bjorklund's due process.

Any additional statements Bjorklund made to Barney that were overheard by inmate Ronald Caples should not be admissible as evidence.

Several times in the motions, Helvie referred to Barney as a "law enforcement agent."

District Judge Donald Endacott will hear the motions Oct. 8.

Jury selection is scheduled to begin Oct. 18 in Sidney. The trial will be held Oct. 25 in Lincoln.



Julia Mikolajcik/DN

Brick-a-brac

Graduate student Michael Morgan sits inside the earthworks sculpture he is working on outside of Richards Hall. See related story on page 8.

Complexities of NAFTA make it muddy issue for many

Free-trade agreement may increase profits for state's farmers

By Dionne Searcey
Senior Reporter

If Congress decides to implement the North America Free Trade Agreement, UNL economists said, its overall impact on Nebraska will be relatively mild.

Wes Peterson, associate professor of agricultural economics, said the fears critics had instilled in Americans about the proposed trade agreement with Mexico and Canada were unjustified.

"The bottom line is the effects of NAFTA on employment are going to be tiny, despite what Ross Perot says," he said.

NAFTA would virtually eliminate trade barriers between the United States, Canada and Mexico. Canada and the United States already have a free-trade pact.

Peterson estimated a total number of 60 to 300 Nebraska jobs would be created by NAFTA. "We're not talking about a huge, huge im-

pact," he said.

Nationwide, Peterson said, the impact will be small as well.

About 200,000 jobs in the United States will be lost Peterson said, and about 400,000 jobs will be created as a result of the agreement.

"In an economy that has 125 million jobs, 200,000 jobs one way or another is pretty irrelevant to the United States," he said.

Most factories that could be tempted to relocate in Mexico already have done so under existing conditions, Peterson said.

Besides, he said, most university students are not looking for factory jobs, but are looking for management jobs in the service sector.

Students aspiring to become doctors, lawyers and business managers need not worry about losing their jobs, he said.

"None of those people are going to move because of free trade with Mexico," Peterson said.

Overall, Nebraskans will benefit from the agreement, he said, because NAFTA will help agriculture.

Statistics compiled by the agricultural economics department show NAFTA is likely to increase the price of corn four to five cents per bushel, Peterson said.

And, he said, Mexicans are future consum-

Congress members disagree about value of trade agreement

By Neil Feldman
Staff Reporter

The North American Free Trade Agreement, a topic that has been in the spotlight for several months, has stirred considerable debate in Washington and throughout the country.

But what the debate is about remains unclear to many.

About 2 1/2 years ago, Congress voted by a large majority to put negotiations of NAFTA on a "fast track," as Rep. Richard Gephardt, D-Mo., put it.

When Congress began working with NAFTA as a priority issue, representatives approached it eagerly, presumably hoping that such an agreement would help steer the country out of recession.

But since the Clinton administration took office, a handful of representatives have come to reject NAFTA, asserting that compromises in the pact negotiated by the Clinton adminis-

tration have unfavorably altered the treaty.

Should NAFTA pass, it would eliminate trade barriers among the United States, Mexico and Canada during the next 10 years.

Those in favor of the agreement say erasing trade barriers would, over time, benefit the economies of all three countries.

NAFTA advocates frequently describe the process as gradual and emphasize the need for caution and patience.

NAFTA opponents say the pact's primary deficiencies are the way wages and work conditions are established. Americans, they say, would be on the losing end of any new jobs created by the agreement.

Opponents of NAFTA argue that Mexico cannot afford to purchase most U.S. products. Those who support NAFTA say the nearly one-third of the Mexican population with relatively high incomes would be able to buy American goods.

In fact, proponents anticipate the Mexican market's potential to be nearly the size of America's export market in Canada.

NAFTA is also expected to encourage a large amount of European and Asian investment in Mexico.

Mexico, opponents argue, would become a foreign export platform aimed at the United

See NAFTA on 7

See TRADE on 6

