

have meant, the language certainly was clarified by the appropriation that was suggested for the A bill as well as the appropriation approved by the body in 1985. As it turns out, apparently there is what is referred to as a systems committee, then the probation composed of some judges as well as some probation officials and apparently they determined in May that these eight positions were to be included in the takeover of the court's costs by the state, notwithstanding the fact that an appropriation had not been made, and that took effect July 1. This brought us to the position where the positions were taken on and the probation system was in the position, notified us in early January, actually before that, last year, that it would be necessary to lay off some probation officers because of the insufficient funding for the eight positions that had not originally been proposed and had not originally been funded. Brought us to the position of where we are, obviously, some appropriation is necessary. The committee amendment reduces the appropriation to \$113,081 compared to the 178,596 that originally was requested by the agency. We arrived at the 113,000 on the basis that that is what would be required to maintain the current probation officers other than the eight positions that had not been included in the original proposal, and that is the purpose of the committee amendment, to again reflect what the Legislature had decided during the 1985 session as well as what had been anticipated to be covered in terms of cost in the 1984 session when the bill was originally enacted. I would move its adopted.

PRESIDENT: There is an amendment to the committee amendment.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Beutler and Senator Higgins would move to amend the committee amendments. (Read amendment offered by Senator Beutler on page 612 of the Legislative Journal.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator...Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: A point of order. There used to be a rule, maybe there isn't one anymore, there used to be a rule that an amendment couldn't reflect the reverse of...there was a limit on what you could do to amend...all you have got to do is defeat the amendment and it comes at that level and it takes 25 votes either way. I don't care which way they want to go.