

Nebraska at this time. Yesterday we took three million plus out of prisons. I voted to take that out of there. I'm not...I'm not comfortable with that vote because I think we're going to need it sometime. But I cannot vote to spend the money on the museum here today when we took the money out of prisons yesterday and so I'm going to support Senator Hall's amendment.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Moore, please. But may I introduce some guests, please. Senator Peterson and Senator Dierks have 33 students in the fifth grade from Tilden-Meadow Grove and Elkhorn Valley Schools and their teachers. They are in the north balcony. Will you folks please stand and let us welcome you to the Legislature, please. Thank you for visiting us this afternoon. Senator Moore, please, followed by Senator Schimek.

SENATOR MOORE: Yes, Mr. President and members, I, like Senator Lamb, am a little hesitant to support this amendment because I, too, am often troubled by, you know, maybe that high...to high of a proportion of our tax dollars in the state go to the, what, Bermuda Triangle, I think, as Senator Scofield, herself, called it, in the eastern part of the state and I would like some projects out in western Nebraska. But I think if you're going to choose some things to do, there is higher items on the priority list than this one. Though I commend Senator Scofield for her skill in getting this program this far, I'm going to vote to take it out and I would rather...once again, this all comes down to priorities and there's some other things I would work with Senator Scofield on for the Panhandle, such as, you know, the business, you know, the granting of business degrees out at Chadron State College, things in Scottsbluff, things in...you know, there's a lot of things out there that I think we could do that would probably be of greater benefit to entire Nebraska, particularly the Panhandle, than this one. Even though I...it is nice that there seems to be a broad base of support from a wide variety of Nebraskans, I, like Senator Lamb, don't think this is quite high enough on the priority list to fund it at this level and I will be supporting Senator Hall's amendment, so in case we continue to be in a great surplus of money, we could go ahead with it if we chose to. But I think Senator Hall's amendment to just put the planning money in so we know where we want to go and then at a later time if indeed that continues to be a high enough priority, we should...we could...at that time could choose to fund it. But in its present form, obviously, if we use the planning money and other