

SENATOR MOORE: Very similar, yes, but...I mean, you are absolutely correct. It doesn't make that much difference, yet the money is not there. It does not show up and saying we are not going to do it until we come back and say yes. He reverses it, instead, everybody gets to come back and say no, the way I understand, next year.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Well, okay, thank you. I would disagree that it wouldn't reverse it at all. The language, in my estimation, is fairly clear in the bill that nothing is going to happen with regards to construction unless this Legislature makes an affirmative yes vote next year. Now, why would we want to leave it the way it is? Senator Moore is absolutely correct. It leaves it in the budget. It takes it off the table, as Senator Hall said, I believe, and the reason why I suggested to Senator Chambers that this may not serve his best interest to support this amendment is because what we have done is we have taken \$3 million off the table and we have said we want to do something about our prison problems. We want to do something about our prison population problems, but we are going to study it, and you can make good arguments as to whether the Corrections Department is the best agency to make that study. That would be a separate issue. However, regardless of who does the study, if the study does come back and says this isn't the way to go, we have better uses, we have county facilities to use, we have city facilities to use, we have a better need in intensive probation. By the way, we did put about nine new probation officers in the budget already in LB 813, so we haven't tried to address this in a piecemeal way. We have tried to look at the total problem. But when you take the money off the table, we are saying it is there. It is to be used for our prison problems. It would be great as far as I am concerned if somebody came back and said let's spend all that money, instead, on intensive probation, in-house arrest monitoring programs, community service, whatever kinds of things, or more rehabilitation programs. If that study came back and said that if we do these things right away, we will not need this, it would be great, but then we have this money available to divert to that program or those series of programs, and, Senator Chambers, in my estimation, it would serve your goal and mine better to leave this money here, to take it off the table, to say, this is earmarked for our problem. I will not support the amendment. I don't think that it does anything different as far as whether we are actually making a decision or not. We will