

has given you good reasons to do this particular system and I don't think there's a soul on the committee that would disagree with the good reasons for doing this system. My sense is that the committee was favorably inclined and believes this system should, in fact, be done, but given the choices that are necessary for this body to make this year, this seemed to be one of those things that could be put off one year in favor of some other actions. Senator Smith made a telling comment yesterday in terms of saying how frustrated she was in spending money on prisons when there are so many other crying needs, whether they are for the elderly, whether they are for the mentally retarded, whether they are for children, and she's right. And we're putting a lot of money this year into law enforcement. We're putting a lot of money into prison construction. We're putting a lot of money to try to do something about drugs. And so this is not the absolute only option that you have to come down hard this year and to show that we're taking crime seriously in Nebraska. If you look at our budget, no one can question that we have taken crime very seriously in Nebraska. And here is some good reasons that I would suggest for putting this off. The AFIS system required funding is \$921,000 per year for five years for its purchase plus \$120,000 per year for operating costs and \$150,000 per year for a maintenance contract on that system. We just felt in the committee that there were other things we had to do first and, yes, we'll do this system. I have no doubt we ought to do this system. I've talked to law enforcement people and asked them about the value of this system and they assured me that it would be valuable, and I believe them. But I think given the place we are in this process and a lot of the things that we all want to do, we simply aren't going to be able to do all of the things that we want to do this year and so it's coming down to that time when we've all got to make our little list and say, I think this is more important than that. And the trouble is the things that you say I don't think are as important as that are still really important and we as a committee decided that this one was important, but it wasn't as important as some of the things that I think that you as a body are going to want to do this year and, therefore, our recommendation was this is something that can wait one year. The other thing I might add is this system is still not one that links state to state. The state of the art technology on this system is still not quite where I'd like it to be, frankly, and sometimes I think when you go in to deal with a vendor on that basis it would be nice to know if, in fact, we're getting the best buy for our money here. It is true that it would enhance