

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

March 27, 2006 LR 259

those statutes were, I believe, if I'm remembering right, in place at the time that the people voted on the Environmental Trust; isn't that accurate?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: And the idea was that people then wouldn't be voting in a vacuum, but they would know what they were voting for; isn't that accurate?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That is, as far as it goes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Right. And you're saying the problem with that is it's kind of...it's misleading, in a way, in the sense that...or bad process, in a way, in the sense that people thought they were voting for a statutory framework and they really weren't; they were voting for a constitutional amendment that didn't say nearly as much, right?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'm not trying to be...do a Fred Astaire or Arthur Murray by dancing around the question, but when there are several things in one of these provisions--money goes to education, money goes to the gamblers' fund, money goes to the State Fair Board, and then to the Environmental Trust--there's no way to determine which one of those, or which, in combination, the public were voting for. And the amendment itself was promoted as the State Fair Board amendment. So I'm not trying to be evasive, but I'm just saying there's no way to pin down why people who voted for that proposal did so.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, I was talking about the original proposition that created the Environmental Trust, not the fair board proposition that amended the language of the Environmental Trust. But let me ask you this.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: You mean...you're talking about the statutory language now?

SENATOR BEUTLER: I'm talking about the original constitutional provision that was put into place, and the set of statutes that were passed along with that, that particular year.