

because I think it is important for you to understand exactly how the issue evolved and what the questions are so that you can make a decision about how it should be handled. Now don't be confused by the number of probation officers that we may be discussing. Essentially, the question is whether eight service department people employed in the juvenile court system in Omaha, the question is whether they are part of the probation system or not, and whether they should be taken in and funded, should have been taken in and funded by LB 13 or not. Now when LB 13 was originally passed, the intent was to take in all of the working units of the probation system in Omaha's Juvenile Court system, and, in my opinion, as an introducer of LB 13, it would have been my intent to take in the service department, those eight employees that are subject today..which are the subject of discussion today. So I think that you can make a very strong argument that the original intent of the proponents of LB 13, of that portion of the Legislature that was proposing LB 13, was to take those service department people into the system. If you want to look at the language of the bill, I passed it out to you so that you understand what the dispute is about. You can see from the exhibit that it says that those positions that will be taken in include intake service, include service, and these are service department people, as exists at a particular point in time, and is taking in all positions necessary to probation services. That is the key language upon which people are making different interpretations, whether these eight service department people were necessary to probation services. I am arguing that under the original intent of the LB 13 sponsors those were necessary. Okay, the Appropriations Committee came along and made the interpretation of LB 13 that they were not necessary and that they should not be funded. So that is an Appropriations Committee interpretation of the proponents of LB 13, which you may or may not agree with. Then the probation system people who are responsible for interpreting the law as it applies to them, they came along and said, we think...we interpret that language to mean that the eight service department people should be taken into the system. Okay, so you have those three elements. You have the original proponents of LB 13. You have the Appropriations Committee position, and you have the appropriation system committee position. So the Appropriations Committee held firm to their interpretation and didn't fund these positions. Nonetheless, the probation committee said to