

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

March 24, 2004      LR 209

We also need to have the standards that we're going to apply. We need to have a delegation to those local school districts. We can't trust the Legislature to do that. What we have to have in there is essentially a statute book. And I got to thinking about it. In fact, I'm not asking you to trust me. I will acknowledge that in fact there is a failure to delineate a fund constitutionally, just as Senator Chambers said. I acknowledge that. So I'm not asking you to trust me. What I am saying is, you know what, this is good enough for jazz. This tells the Legislature what to do. And what it says to the Legislature is this: the money goes to the environment, stick it in the Environmental Trust Fund, and have primarily grants made out of that fund for private or public grants out of that fund. Senator Chambers will argue that that...you cannot trust the Legislature to do that. He also says that does not delineate all scenarios, and on that score I agree with him. It does not delineate all scenarios. Fair enough. What about the risk of evil, or the chance of ill use? My guess is Senator Chambers would say, look, it's possible that it lies there. And I would say, you know, that lies with us. If the constitution says that, do you think the Legislature could read the signals clear enough? And I think they will. Do you have faith that they'll follow them? I do; Senator Chambers doesn't. There's a difference of opinion. In that case, if you regard a Legislature as being unable to understand what that says, or desirous of subverting it, I would vote with Senator Chambers. If you think it's clear enough so that it gives sufficient signals to a Legislature, and you believe that a Legislature would probably do its best to follow the letter of the constitution, I'd suggest that you vote with me. I'm not suggesting that you trust me. I am suggesting you decide on whether or not a future Legislature could be trusted, and I would suggest that you use yourself as the model. There is a big difference between this pot of money and the other pots of money which we have raided. And the pots of money that we've raided and subverted for its use to some other purpose are pots of money that we created. This is a pot of money that the public created, with a particular understanding from us. And by the way, spending the money for policy...water policy management is not a subversion. That's environment. That, I think, fits what this language says. I think it's legitimate. By the way,