

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, sometimes I think that we get so emotionally caught up in what we want to do that we don't listen to good sense. Let me repeat, all the amendment says is that before we give an agency of government the authority to spend 1.3 million dollars that we require them to see that the federal commitment has been made. The way the bill reads right now they could take that 1.3 of planning money and spend it and if the federal funds don't come through all that money would have been spent for nothing. It is like a homeowner planning to buy a house. Until he knows that the money is there to buy a house he doesn't go spend two, three or four thousand dollars for an architect and architectural plans and specifications, it just doesn't make sense on a personal level and it doesn't make sense on a governmental level. There was talk about having good faith in the government. We have to treat people with good faith. That is fine perhaps, at least defensible, if someone has come to you and said we are going to kick in so much money, trust us. But the federal government has never said, has never indicated that they are going to kick in that money. We have had a change of administration since this thing began and we are all well aware that the President has embarked upon a program of gorging everybody's ox in the interest of the common good. A program that I think we are all supporting, but in my personal opinion it is highly likely that one of the areas that will be cut might well be this area. I think that anybody taking an objective look at it would have to candidly admit that. If that should happen and if that agency out there should have spent three or four or a million dollars what are the people of the state going to say to us? What are they going to say about our fiscal responsibility? Gentlemen, this amendment doesn't kill the project. The funds can be appropriated and when the funds are appropriated we are saying to the federal government the money is sitting there to be spent by the agency and the only condition is that you tell us you are giving us the money. Clear signal? How can it be any clearer than to have us waste our money and actually spend it before they tell us? Surely the proponents are not arguing that what is required in this case is that we show our good faith by actually expending the money before the federal government commits itself. Never in the history of the federal government can I remember that requirement being laid on a state. It is absolutely preposterous and ridiculous and if we from Nebraska, of all places buy that, WOW! That is all that I would say in closing Mr. Speaker. Mr. Clerk, I would ask you to change the reference from section two to section one as that is a typographical error and incorrect. It was pointed out to me, thank you Senator Barrett.