

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President, I really find Senator Johnson's arguments somewhat remarkable. You are taking money from a fund. Okay? You have already approved a certain quantity of expenditures, the roads department budget for roads. One way or another, whether it occurs in this quarter, whether it occurs by fudging in another quarter, these additional dollars, by law, have to come from the gasoline tax. Now, that's a simple fact. To then argue that, yes, but because you've got a 90 percent and a fudge factor and this and that, you might not have to do it now and the Governor could delay doesn't alter one simple fact. If you have a hundred dollar fund, and you take five out of it and you have a debt to pay over here of \$100, then that five has to be replaced, by law, whether it occurs now or in a quarter or whether you juggle, an additional \$5.00 of gasoline tax is going to be raised. And to play that silly game of juggling and saying, well, maybe they could delay this and wouldn't have to do that, it doesn't alter the fact that you're \$5.00 short. That's it. Okay, I would submit to you that about all you will get out of this amendment is a court test. Why? Because once again you have not altered the quantity you have already approved for the roads. You've spent your \$100 for roads. You're not changing that. Now you're trying to say with this amendment, that after you've taken the \$5.00 out and you've already approved \$100 of expenditure over here, that you're not going to allow them to make it up. What have you generated? You have generated a court test. You have ordered somebody, under law, to go ahead and build a road that costs \$100 and you have said, and we're not going to give you the money for it. What have you done? You have generated a court test. You have just...you haven't cut spending. If you do the proper amendment, which is to go into the Appropriations budget with respect to the roads and actually cut, just like you're cutting the University or you're cutting this or that, you actually say, we are reducing your roads construction \$5.00, \$5 million, whatever it is. That's a different matter. I'm not saying I would support it, but at least if you're going to do this, do it in the proper manner. Cut your expenditure. That's the only way to do it and this is not a proper amendment to accomplish that. As I say, I'm not even sure what it means. It is very vague. It says, reductions in the Highway Allocation Fund or the Highway Cash Fund attributable to legislative action. Legislative action