differentiating between operational and mechanical provisions could well be left to statute. It could be in the infinite wisdom of the Constitutional Convention Commission that they would want to take cognizance of these things.

For example, what you know now is in the budget bill is the operating budget and the capital budget comes up actually as a supplement, with its own source of revenue. In the case of it being financed from bonds, this is a source of revenue and, to my utter amazement, the Court of

bill for capital improvements is a, well, it's both an appropriation and revenue measure because it is supplemental billing. Usually these are differentiated.

Appeals has also ruled that this is, this appropriation

This brings up the question that Lauber mentioned about putting the appropriation in the specific bill where additional legislation is introduced, and that I would object to, on the basis that it is not considered good legislative draftmanship to include appropriations in substantive measures. As a matter of fact, at the Federal level, this is prohibited.

THE CHAIRMAN: In bills of that nature, if you

10

11.

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21