

make that decision next year, and it will take an affirmative vote. It isn't a matter of saying, well, if you don't vote no, it happens, or if you don't vote yes, it happens. We will be required to make an affirmative vote, and by taking it off the table and saying this is earmarked money for our problem, to me, makes good sense.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Hannibal has indicated what I was going to say, too, because it seems the impression has gained momentum that the money was appropriated, and it is a contention appropriation subject to the approval of this body. The language is very clear, the construction and renovation of such projects shall not begin until such project is approved by the Legislature. The difference is that you are in a biennial budget issue and there is \$3 million being "reserved" to address the issue in the second half of the biennium, and that, it seems to me, is very prudent. That other alternatives can be developed and should be developed was the very reason this kind of language was put in in hopes of being able to do exactly that. The only difference is, if you adopt Senator Moore's amendment, then next year you start from scratch. You have no money to reallocate. You have whatever might be available with all the other competition. I think we need to address the problems in corrections. There isn't any question about that. It is going to, in my opinion, require some facilities, but in addition to that, it also should be looking at all the alternatives that are there. I read an interesting document, Senator Landis, from one of your constituents awhile back who did a paper on alternatives to incarceration, masters, I think, or a doctors, I believe, but in any event, there are other things to address and that is exactly what we are proposing is to look at those as we go along. The other thing I ought to mention, I know that there was some comments, I think, Senator Chambers, you mentioned salaries. Of course, what was funded is exactly what was negotiated. One can argue whether that was negotiated by both parties the same or not, I don't know. Nevertheless, it is what they all agreed to and that was funded, which was a 5 percent increase each year, plus a shift differential increase over the two years as well, but I would hope you do not take the money out. And, again, it cannot be spent until this body approves in a future session. It is reserved but not authorized to spend.