

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

March 27, 2006 LR 259

I think that the phrasing was designed to have a particular outcome, in terms of what the...how people voted. Do you think all of the money from the Environmental Trust Fund should be awarded on a competitive basis--those are very nice words that make it sound like a good thing--or should be taken by the Legislature and spent how they see fit? The wording of this I think was very effective in accomplishing the outcome, in terms of the vote, but I don't think that the average citizen would feel as strongly about the process by which the board makes its decisions, and that's really what we're talking about. In this amendment we're not talking about reserving the money for the environment, we're not talking about raiding it. We are talking about the process by which those grants are made. And we're not talking about taking anything away or adding anything to; we are just talking about the Environmental Trust Board wishing to have their process put more specifically into the constitution than what we have right now. And I'm not certain that I believe that this accurately reflects how strongly the average citizen would feel about the process. Thank you.

SENATOR BAKER: Thank you, Senator Brown. Senator Jensen. Senator Jensen? Senator Jensen waives. Senator Wehrbein.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I rise to oppose Senator Schrock's amendment, primarily because of the taking away of the flexibility that I think is needed. I understand the concerns about locking it in, from the Environmental Trust standpoint, and I certainly would respect that their view is that they should have total control over that fund. But I think over the long term, it's a mistake to put it in the constitution. I understand the statutory change. The statutes is where I think it belongs. It gives some flexibility. But once it's locked in the constitution, it will never change. And if we would promise and guarantee that there will never be another crisis in the future in state government, I would change my mind, perhaps. But I think as this probably, gradually over time, is going to build in the terms of the number of dollars available--it's roughly \$8 million to \$10 million now, and I would assume that it'll at least hold its own, and perhaps increase--I just think it's a mistake to lock this in granite, so to speak, and not give us the...not