

something I would support to actually generate this \$100,000 next year. And so for the time being we can put it in the A bill for the second year. But I would be working with Senator Beutler to try and develop some alternative revenue streams to generate that. So when the time actually comes for the state to pay something for development, it would be my hope that it would not actually be out of the General Fund, but would be generated by some other fund source. And so, with that, I'd support Senator Warner's amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. Speaker and members, I have a question for Senator Warner, if he'd yield.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Warner, would you respond, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Yes.

SENATOR LAMB: Under the terms of your amendment, Senator Warner, it...there would be no General Fund money in the '91-92 session, but then would that...that would not come before the body again. It would go directly to the...it would be a decision of the Appropriations Committee to make the future appropriations in that regard, and so it would be in the total budget bill, but would not be a separate item that we'd be voting on, here on the floor. Is that correct?

SENATOR WARNER: It would be correct that it would...it would not come back to the floor, unless someone introduced a bill to not continue the appropriation for the second half of the biennium. My assumption is that, as would always be the case, the Appropriations Committee would be reviewing all appropriations the second half of the biennium. And, if we are in financial difficulties, they would be looking for areas that they could defer. This may well be one then. And then it would come before the body as a...in the deficit bill, as an adjustment to the second half of the biennium's appropriation.

SENATOR LAMB: Thank you, Senator Warner. Well, this certainly is an improvement over the current status of the bill, however I always have a problem with these funding mechanisms that, in essence, delay the funding a year, or some term of years, and then it's not specifically brought back to the attention of the full Legislature. It really becomes an ongoing expense item