

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

April 3, 2006

LR 259

think for similar reasons that Senator Bourne has pointed out. The interesting thing about this discussion is probably not what's being said. And maybe this isn't the intent, and I'm sure there are those that will speak to this. But where the language in the constitution just says that we can spend the money as the Legislature directs for the education, there doesn't seem to be a rush to demand that that be protected in the constitution. And I think that's somewhat of what Senator Bourne has pointed out, that either the people in the education community trust the Legislature more than others that would require a protection in the constitution, or there is a different reason. And at this point, I don't know what that different reason would be. But as a simple reading of the language would show, that we're protecting three of the four provisions, actually protecting the State Fair as well. They get their \$2 million guaranteed, and you can have cities use whatever method they would like to meet that match in order to get that money. So it's a concern of mine. And I fully support the ideas that are being presented to us about the good things that are done by the Environmental Trust. It's the idea that it's in favor of the environment and promoting things, as Senator Schrock has pointed out, on water law and other things. And there's projects going on in western Nebraska that are supported by the Environmental Trust which I think are worthwhile projects. But it comes down, to me, a question that I would hope would be answered is, is there not a similar level of trust that we're not spending the money the way the board would like us to spend it, or is that too broadly defined as environment? Where education is simply defined as education, which we're using the money for low-income scholarships for higher education, we're going to use it for distance education. And had similar protections been in the constitution for those programs, we would be handcuffed in the state to be able to provide those opportunities. So I'm fully concerned about...or, I'm fully consistent with the idea that we need to do the good things and we need to balance the interests and make sure that things are funded appropriately. But at the same point, we need to make sure that we have flexibility to make sure that what we're doing is consistent. And it appears that with this amendment we're not even being consistent within the same entities that are being addressed. So I'd like to know why that