

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

March 24, 2004 LR 209, 257, 258, 259

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...that however way, they understand it or don't understand it, will nevertheless leave intact that the money goes to the State Fair Board. You notice he doesn't say anything about how the State Fair Board spends its money, says nothing about how the compulsive gambling money is to be spent, or whether there even has to continue to be a Compulsive Gamblers Fund. The only thing ensured is the State Fair Board getting this money. But what we can do if we want to is abolish the State Fair and abolish the State Fair Board. And if worse comes to worse, you will have a percentage of the lottery money that cannot be spent. I don't trust the Legislature in the way Senator Landis is talking about. I don't even trust this Legislature, Senator Landis. That's why I operate in the way that I do. And I'll put my light on again. But thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Chambers. While the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do sign LR 257, LR 258, and LR 259. Senator Landis, and this will be your third time, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature. Senator Chambers, let me point you to, for example, the State Constitution, Article I. Bill of Rights, Section 17: "The military shall be in strict subordination to the civil power." There is no definition of "strict." There is no definition of "subordination." There is no definition of "civil" or "power." In the next one, Section 19: "The right of the people peaceably to assemble to consult for the common good, and to petition the government, or any department thereof, shall never be abridged." "Peaceably" is not defined. "Assemble" is not defined. "Consult" is not defined, nor is "the common good." What you ask for is not the nature of constitutions, and what you ask for is, in fact, a lawyer's trick, a very good one, I confess, but the precedent is not on your side here. Look, what we do is we use words in common meaning, we put them in this document, we turn it to the Legislature to do its best in carrying it out, and when the Legislature fails, we go to court to apply meaning to these words. We do not define them regularly. I got to say, that's part of the deal about a