

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

March 24, 2004 LR 209

I think it would be legitimate as a grant. I think it would be legitimate for a use of the money. So there is a difference of opinion here. I would acknowledge that in fact it does not create a fund. The question is how much fear or danger you think there is in a Legislature subverting the rationale or purpose of this language. If you think there's a significant one, I'd side with Senator Chambers. I don't, which is why I support the amendment as it's written.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Don Pederson.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature. Senator Landis, I have a question for you.

SPEAKER BROMM: Senator Landis, would you yield, please?

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: They way I'm reading...

SENATOR LANDIS: (Inaudible) question you already know the answer to. By the way, if it is, I don't think...

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: I hope...

SENATOR LANDIS: ...there's much purpose of asking. Go ahead.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: No, I hope you know the answer to this.

SENATOR LANDIS: Good.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: I'm speculating. But it appears to me in reading this that you say that the Water Task Force, for example, is an environmental purpose. But doesn't this amendment say that that, together with any other purpose, would need to be resolved through competitive grants?

SENATOR LANDIS: It does say that the money would need to be put in the Environmental Trust Fund, and it does say that the money needs to be used primarily for grants.

SENATOR D. PEDERSON: What does that mean, "primarily"?