

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 8, 2004

LR 209

language and I can read the actual amendment, because I don't know if you have it, and it gets inserted on page 2, in line 10, after "used," would insert "primarily for competitive grants to political subdivisions and private entities to conserve, enhance, and restore the natural, physical, and biological environment of Nebraska, for related transfers to the Nebraska Environmental Endowment Fund, and for related administrative expenses." So the expenses for operating of the endowment, the expenses for operating the trust would be included. However, it gives, I think, some clarity. It's some additional verbiage, certainly, but it earmarks or directs this money to where I believe it should go. That language takes away some of my concern, and part of my concern comes from the fact that we do have term limits, and those term limits are going to mean we have a whole new group of folks here, and those new folks aren't going to know some of the history. Those folks are going to see people attempting to take money from the Environmental Trust, and the attempts that have been made in the past, some successful, some not successful, I feel are likely to be even more successful and we end up not really doing the things that we need to do for the environment. I recognize that this is after a weekend and after some discussion, even just this morning, to finalize the language in this, so many people would not have had a chance to fully look at it, digest it. I would ask Senator Landis if he might respond to a question or two and to get some feedback. Senator Landis, would you yield to some questions?

SPEAKER BROMM: Senator Landis.

SENATOR PREISTER: Senator Landis, I was just discussing this, just had a chance to share it with everyone and with you. I think you understand what I said about my concern...

SENATOR LANDIS: Uh-huh.

SENATOR PREISTER: ...about having the language specifically stating that this money does go to the environment. Would you comment on this language or your thoughts about some assurance that we actually make sure the money does go to the environmental programs that I think it needs to go to.