

year and the summer the we tner...it seems like summer this winter, a lot of that construction is ahead of time. There are other similar things that I could go down the line with. I share the same concern that I hear Senator Hall expressing about are we going to be building up a lot of expenditures on the end that we do not have the revenue to fund? That is for '87-88. But for this year, for the '86-87 fiscal year, this particular program is a replacement of a piece of broken equipment. Obviously it will be done, it has to be done. There is one other little caveat to this thing, under the original federal grant, when the whole ETV system was put up, one of the conditions of those grants was the state would maintain them, and if we fail to maintain, we have to pay the money back. Well, we know that isn't going to happen. It is not even a practical problem, but, nevertheless, it is a fact that if we did not replace that tower, at any time, that eventually we would probably be involved in negotiations or a lawsuit with the feds for failing to have done what the state agreed to do back in 1965. That is not an issue, just a condition. I hope you would reject the amendment to delay the bill so that that service is not delayed in its being restored. But I hope you would take to heart what Senator Hall is talking about on the concern of new programs. Most assuredly I would hope that if this bill is advanced, because it is unique and it is different, that someone doesn't decide, well, now we are going to do all new programs, all expenditure bills because we did this one. This is a unique situation. It is a deficit. There is no question but what it needs to be done, no question but what it will be done. And the only thing that delay on this bill does is delays restoration of the service. What I am really concerned, if you delayed it, or do not delay it, rather, is that somebody is then going to turn around and argue, well, we passed this one, so you've got to pass all the rest. It is different.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Lamb, followed by Senator Rogers.

SENATOR LAMB: Mr. President, members, I rise to oppose the bracketing motion. Most of the reasons have already been given. I would note that Senator Hall said that he would support this project. He did not say that I'll look at the other appropriations bills at a later time and decide whether I'll support it. He categorically said, I'll support it. So, using that reasoning, I see no reason to delay it. There is no reason to delay it. We should vote it now so that this six month delay