

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

March 24, 2004 LR 209

talk about, trust us, it's to be a local contribution and we don't envision the state being involved. So the amendment can be rejected, but I'm putting it up there. Remember, and it shows again why we should be dealing statutorily and not constitutionally, the language that we put in the constitution is significant, and what we do not put into the constitution is also significant. I'd like to ask Senator Bourne a question...

SENATOR JANSSEN: Senator Bourne.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...because I'm seeking to amend his amendment.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Senator Bourne, will you respond?

SENATOR BOURNE: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Bourne, is there anything in the language of your amendment, as it exists now, that would prevent the state or prohibit the state from appropriating money to meet the matching amount that this city is obliged to put up?

SENATOR BOURNE: Senator Chambers, it's not...it's not a yes or no question, or a yes or no answer. If I can have just a second,...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Sure.

SENATOR BOURNE: ...in order for the state's contribution to be counted as part of the city's match, the state would have to give that money to the city...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR BOURNE: ...and then the city would have to put that money into the fair. So, as Senator Landis mentioned earlier, that \$300,000 that you took away from the kids earlier in the year, that money went right to the fair board, as I understand it. There's no way under the amendment, as drafted, that that \$300,000 that went to the fair board could be considered the city's match.