

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

April 14, 2004 LR 209

could a Supreme Court. And while there may be other ways and better ways or different ways to write them, they're unnecessary in that the meaning is self-evident. Senator Chambers says I don't show you respect by drafting this in a way that would, you know, tie things down. I actually think I am the one who is showing you respect by saying, you know what, this is clear enough, we all could get this, and we will. I have respect for you that you'll be able to read the plain meaning of the constitution and follow it. I don't think you need to be trapped. I don't think you are pernicious. I think you can read that which I just read to you and know what your duty is. And then you know what? I expect you to follow it. And by the way, I think the Supreme Court would do the same. I think I'm the one who is showing respect here. Now am I showing respect for the constitution? I will say this; Senator Chambers tries to collapse priorities with all money as if it was in exactly the same pot and exactly the same situation and it's not. The sales and income tax dollars, creations essentially of our own statutory authority, which we put into the big pot of the General Fund, is different than the lottery money altogether. It's not in the same pot. The lottery money never goes to the General Fund. The lottery money stays separate and is treated separately. It has priorities which have been given to it statutorily, absolutely, but a statutory priority given with the clear acknowledgement to the public that that was part of the deal. The deal was will you let us create a lottery if we spend the money for natural resources and for education? And the public came back and said, yes, we will. And now the question is going to be, look, can we have a lottery in which we spend the money for education, natural resources, and the State Fair? And the public is going to say one of two things: yes or no. And when we do, we will have a clear sense of the public's sense of priorities. Senator Chambers is right, money involves priorities, but this question is theirs to answer, not ours. This was their priority when they passed the lottery, not ours. And to the extent that we change the deal I think we need to ask them for their sense of priorities. And, Senator Chambers, they may say no. They may say it is nostalgia, a bad idea, it's not as important. And I'll be able to live with that. By the way, as the person who represents this area in the Legislature, I will understand that the public will have said no to the State