

**SPEAKER NICHOL:** I think Senator Beutler's light is the only other one on. With that, I would think he could close. Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Beutler, would you like to close please.

**SENATOR BEUTLER:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I think that the amendment is quite clear. I want to try once more to delineate for you exactly what it is that I am doing. First of all the amount of money, the amount of money that is in the bill right now is \$250,000 a year. The amount of money, under my amendment, would be \$200,000. The reason that I brought it down to \$200,000 is because essentially with the \$250,000 amount and the requirement that you could spend only 75 percent of it, basically, what you were saying is that about \$200,000 is the most you could spend this year or in any one year. So that is what I've done. I've said for this year apparently the Legislature is saying \$200,000 is about what we think is the proper level of spending. So that is what happens to the money amount. Now on the trust fund, the trust fund is not eliminated as a concept. The trust fund will continue to be there. It will continue to be a receptacle for federal funds, for private funds of any nature. The \$200,000 that I was talking about earlier, out of general appropriations, will go into the trust fund. If that is the basis for federal matching funds, if there are federal matching funds for that kind of money, then that \$200,000 will be there for the match. I suppose if you had \$250,000 and there were funds available for a one-on-one match you'd get more federal money. But by that logic you ought to put a half a million dollars into it, or a million. That is not really the criteria, is it? The criteria is how much do you need. So it is a limited measure, just deals with the building up of the trust fund, prohibits the building up of the trust fund, treats this particular cause as we have treated so many other good causes in our time and as they have been treated before our time, and that is simply appropriating them on a year-by-year basis on the basis of the need for that year and not treating them in any way differently. Basically, what I am suggesting to you is fundamentally a very traditional and conservative approach. It actually surprises me and has caught me off guard that some of the people in this Legislature, who are traditionally the most fiscally conservative people, are promoting a concept here which is, in my opinion, fiscally irresponsible. So with