

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

March 24, 2004 LR 209

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature. This proposed amendment, as I read it, further stipulates in detail, or would stipulate in detail in the constitution exactly how the lottery money that comes to the Legislature is spent. As a general principle, I am opposed to that. I think the Legislature has acted responsibly, needs to be given discretion to use those funds as it deems appropriate at the time in question. There is statutory language in place now that directs the money to education and environmental uses. I think that's adequate. I certainly believe that in this particular time it makes good sense to use lottery money from the Environmental Trust side, if you will, to fund the Water Task Force efforts. I do support that. I think that makes good sense. I don't see that it is helpful to try to put something in the constitution that would raise questions about that sort of a move, either now or in the future. So I am opposed to this amendment, and I will vote against it. Thank you.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Raikes. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to briefly support the amendment. In some instances, one might take the sides, I think, of Senator Raikes. It's certainly something to think about. On the other hand, this is a unique matter, in the sense that you may recall, we voted the lottery funds for use for environmental purposes, and not only did we vote them for that use, but we passed statutes explicitly defining that use. And so what is being suggested here is really no more than the use has been and as the use should, in my opinion at least, continue to be. Please note some things in the language that Senator Landis has used. It indicates that it should be used for environmental purposes, and sets forth some explanation of that. But that still wouldn't preclude, for example, an environmental purpose related to the water issue that we had before us this year. There may be some sort of issue like that, where money would be diverted to that environmental purpose. It would be limited a little bit by the language that indicates that the money would be used primarily through a grant process with the local political subdivisions. That's what's happening now, 80 to 90 percent of the money at least is going through the grant process. So it's not real strict, restricting language, but