

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

March 23, 2006 LB 1208

SENATOR SMITH: So are you saying we've kind of gotten away from the innovation objectives with the lottery dollars over the last few years?

SENATOR RAIKES: I think that's a fair statement. I think that you may remember that during the times when the state was experiencing extreme shortages of revenues back in the early 2000s, we took the entire lot of funding out of the...well, or I should say, we used the...we transferred lottery monies into the General Fund. And kind of the argument at that point was that we were looking at a situation where, do we want to support a program, although certainly a valuable program, that was innovative and might offer some valuable insights about education down the line, or do we in fact want to heat the building? We had more immediate needs that we had to address, so that's what we did. Since that time, in redirecting or reconsidering how we use that money, we, yes, have come to different programs, rather than just going back to the way it was before. And one of those is we made a significant addition of...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR RAIKES: ...that funding to the need-based aid program.

SENATOR SMITH: Okay. And then further along in your amendment, you say, "after administrative expenses" in each of the paragraphs. What is the need to stipulate that? And I'm wondering if you would be open to capping the administrative expenses?

SENATOR RAIKES: Senator, I for some reason don't have that right in front of me. And I assume that the reason for that being in there is "draftese," that that was the appropriate way to put it together. I don't, frankly, know exactly how much administrative expense might be expected, but I probably would need to get some information on that before I could tell you whether or not I would agree to a particular cap, because I don't know what might be required.