

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

March 4, 2004

LR 209

which is sort of schizophrenic. In one sense, he says, it's not my constitution, there's nothing in that constitution for black people; it's a white person's document. On the other hand, he doesn't want it diluted by tomfoolery, as this piece would be done, the tomfool being on this side of the aisle, and the protector of the constitution on the other. There's a couple of things. Past that point, Senator Chambers makes the point that he thinks that the language is inoperative. And I would suggest that I read the...this is how I would read it. There...because there is a place where Senator Chambers and I might agree. Here's the operative language: "The proceeds of the lottery shall be appropriated by the Legislature for the costs of establishing and maintaining the lottery and for the following purposes as directed by the Legislature." Now it depends on how much you read the phrase "as directed by the Legislature." I would read it to this end. Senator Chambers is accurate when he says the Legislature could end the existence of the funds that are created by this language. The constitution doesn't create funds; the Legislature does. To that end, I would agree with him. What, however, Senator Chambers seems to imply is that at that point the Legislature could do ever what they want to with the money. And there we part company, because to me there is meaning in the language of the constitution that says the proceeds of the lottery shall be appropriated for the following purposes, which means that in the event the Legislature were to end these funds, constitutionally I think one of two things happens. First, the Legislature can't redirect the money someplace else. The constitution says it will be spent for these purposes. Now, if the Legislature won't spend it for that purpose--and by the way, the Legislature is the appropriating authority, that's true--if we won't spend them for those purposes, I might agree that, in fact, the constitution couldn't require the expenditure, but that's possible. But the constitution is effective to say that the Legislature can't do certain things. And when they say the money shall be spent for these purposes, I trust the Supreme Court to say the Legislature will not...is not authorized to spend it for other purposes. I think, in other words, if we were to undo these funds, as I think he rightly says is under our control, we do not have the freedom to spend this money any way we want to. What this says is, these are the legitimate purposes for which we spend these