

think is the date, that we have passed and either passed and not funded, passed by the Legislature and had been vetoed, innovative programs that did not pass, all because we didn't have the money. So I support a portion of this money going to education. I think another reason for doing that is that that, during the campaign rhetoric about passing a state lottery, the two issues were tied together, a lottery to improve education. But I think Senator Hall has a good idea, and that is we ought to split the pot. We ought to say half of the money goes to education, half of the money goes to other one-time projects that will be decided by the Legislature at future dates. So I would suggest the best method in dealing with the whole lottery issue would be to not support these specific amendments earmarking particular funds, but to support Senator Hall's amendment, and I was not ready to do that a week ago. I was going to want to hang on to all of it for education, but I think probably his approach is the better. Half of the money goes for educational enhancement as lotteries tend to go in lots of states, the other half of it goes to one-time projects, say one year it might be programs to benefit the aging. Other years it might be programs that benefit other groups, those in need of health care, as Senator Lynch's previous amendment dealt with. So with that in mind, I will not be voting for Senator Smith's amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Withem. Next speaker, Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Mr. President and members, I guess I join the chorus in rising to oppose Senator Smith's amendment, for little different reasons, although not actually that different. Obviously, my concern about if, indeed, this state chooses to have a lottery, my concern is that any of these lottery funds do not go onto ongoing programs. I think the only prudent thing to do with these funds, since I am one that is convinced that it will be a declining revenue source in the future, the prudent use of these funds is to put them towards one-time type of activity, like capital construction, or some sort of acquisition program, where when the funds go away, the need, at least, goes away. And, obviously, Senator Smith's amendment, like the CHIP that Senator Lynch talked about, are very worthwhile programs, and the argument can certainly be made by these groups and others that, well, just give us the money while it comes in, and then when it goes away, we will go away. And certainly it has been my experience in the past, that is not the case. Whatever