

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

March 8, 2004 LR 209

at this point. What we want to make sure is that, in fact, the money gets spent for the purposes of the environment, we get money spent for the purposes of education, and we want to take to the public whether or not they would accept the addition of the State Fair as a legitimate recipient for money. Senator Maxwell, I think, wants to make sure that I address that fact. I want to not only justify the State Fair, but the unique aspect of taking it to the constitution is to tell or ask the public whether we may add to the ideas that they previously supported. The public told us that the environment and education were legitimate ways to spend money for the lottery. I think that's a fair characterization of what the public has told us. This stands for the proposition of going back to the public and asking them, would it be all right to take 10 percent of the lottery money and spend it for the State Fair? I will say that there is a little bit of rhetoric that's crept in that's not true. Senator Chambers is accurate when he says it reduces the percentage that goes to environment and to the education. What is not true is that it reduces the absolute amount of money. Now if the pot had stayed the same, he would be right. In fact, it would be an actual reduction of the amount of money we'd spend. But the pie in the lottery is going to get larger here this year. One of the reasons is because we have readjusted a management contract and reduced from 11 percent to about 3 percent the administrative costs of that portion of the lottery. What that means is that the lottery pot will grow by about almost exactly this amount of money, which means while it's true the percentages will go down, the absolute dollars will not be going down for education and the environment in the coming year. The pot will grow larger by greater administrative efficiency and that greater administrative efficiency is essentially 10 percent of the lottery, which means the argument is accurately stated the percentage goes down. It overstates the case when it says the money will go down. In fact, our best guess is that it won't go down for the environment and education. Why do we do this? To let the public decide whether this is a legitimate goal...

SPEAKER BRÖMM: One minute.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...to take its place, besides the goals that