

clear what your focus is, and that's that the monies be only used for 309, and that's basically for current buildings and the renovation of current buildings, and it's not used for new construction. Is that correct? And then you can have the balance of my time to answer. Thank you.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator, if you'd care to use the time, you have two and a half minutes.

SENATOR LYNCH: Okay, thank you very much. I've talked more today than I have, I think, in a long time. I'm concerned about this kind of a tax being rated as good causes come along, and they're all good causes. I'm also concerned with sources of funds that can be used for building renovation. You know we could talk about this all day. But for example, you know, if all the agencies in the state, Senator Maurstad, you've been, I think, and understand this as much as anybody. If all of the agencies in the state had a depreciation factor in the budget for the buildings they've got and it was used to maintain those buildings, we wouldn't even be talking about this right now. Is that irresponsible on their part? I think it is. Do they do it? No, because we don't insist that they do it. And as long as we have a source of funds like cigarette tax money that they can raid for other purposes, and we continue to put off a responsibility that they ought to be providing for themselves, we're going to continue to have this problem. I don't know, you think for example why are we doing this for three or four years? Why don't we just do this for one year. You know the cigarette tax we're losing, by the way, is \$2.5 million, it's not the whole 7 or 8 million, because agencies and some left over funds from other sources are going to be used for the first year. That's a bundle of money, that's a parcel of money, that's 7 or \$8 million, whatever it is. Maybe an amendment would work, rather than striking all of Section 13,...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR LYNCH: ...just to strike it except for the first year, and then maybe, at that point in time, we'll get some advice from somebody when they know we're not going to give them \$30 million to find the solution to the problem, that we're maybe only going to give them 8 or maybe only going to give them 16, that they might even find a solution. Wouldn't that be wonderful? And that possibility exists. So maybe a realistic