

March 16, 1981

LB 245

the appropriations shall not be obligated prior to a commitment from the federal government that the federal funds are going to be there. According to the schedule that we have been given federal funds are anticipated to be used next year, and as Senator Schmit has indicated, should not be...it should not be in the distant future when the federal government makes known its course of action. So all the amendment is saying is that we should not obligate or spend any of our money on this project until we know that all the financial elements necessary to make the project go are in place. So, in other words, it seems to me that it is an amendment that directs itself to fiscal responsibility that we all, urban or rural or Republican or Democrat, should be able to understand. Don't throw a bunch of money out for planning. Don't go ahead and spend hundreds of thousands or the whole \$1.3 million that's planned to be spent in 1981-'82 before we know for sure that the federal funds will be there. That is the intent and the sole direction of this amendment. I would also mention to you that it also mentions bonds and says that the bonds will not be authorized. They are not intended for a couple of years any way and that shouldn't be an important point. But the City of Lincoln at this point in time as far as I know has not acted or even been requested to act upon whether they would be agreeable to issuing these bonds. So that is a matter that remains to be resolved. So that is why I included the bond provision also. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Kahle, do you wish to speak to the Beutler amendment?

SENATOR KAHLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is going to be a little tough to stick to the amendment but I will try. I naturally oppose the amendment because if Senator Beutler had been one of the proponents of the bill, I could understand perhaps this kind of language, but as he is not, I think it is a tactic to harm the process, and therefore oppose the amendment. If you took the amendment exactly as it reads, there probably isn't much wrong with it. But this is going to be a process and we all know it but we are going to have to go some on good faith. We are going to have to go on good faith that we are going to get a couple of other states involved. We are going to have to go on good faith that perhaps the City of Lincoln might become involved. We are certainly going to have to go on good faith as to what the federal government is going to do. So to put this in a specific amendment at this time I think is wrong. I think we need