

Legislature, let me say, initially, I understand that we probably, in the final analysis, don't have any choice but the full dollar amount. But it is somewhat important to me, at least, that what really occurred is what is understood. Senator Beutler suggested the Appropriations Committee made some arbitrary decision and we did not. What we funded was what the sponsors had put in the A bill for LB 13. And, as I recall last year's request, there was something well over 800,000 requested by the...in the two programs over and above the A bill. We applied the same rule that we apply to any new program as a reflection of what the sponsors of the legislation intended and that is to fund it at what they said it was going to cost. So it was treated no differently than anything else. There was nothing arbitrary on our part. If there was something arbitrary in the A bill, I don't know anything about that. I had no part in it, nor did the Appropriations Committee have any part in it. So it should be clear, if it was any other agency, you all full well we would leave them...we would let them burn for what they had done. They knew in May. We had a letter from the Attorney General in November that I wrote for when it became apparent again what had occurred and that letter indicated that limitation was what was appropriated and if they chose to take on something that wasn't appropriated for, that was outside of the discretion they had, or, at least, they were running the chance on whether or not we would pick it up. We are probably in sort of an impossible position, as, obviously, you can't...you cannot just ignore the needs of necessary supervision of probation people. In fact, we recognized that in the special session. We made less...recommended less reduction for probation than anybody else, although we repeated the position that those positions had not been covered. What should have been done properly was that those positions would not have been taken over July 1st. They would have continued to be funded as they previously had intended to be funded by the provisions of the A bill and then they could have properly come in now and asked for a deficiency appropriation to take it over. That would have been proper. It is the kind of thing that happens not infrequently where some expense is not anticipated by the Legislature and we do a deficiency appropriation, recognizing the necessity. But what we do not do, unless it is a built-in provision by law that requires retroactive funding, like Special Education is, what we do not do is fund programs that an agency went ahead and spent the money for even though they didn't have it. We