

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I was just going to make a couple of brief remarks about what people perceive as the essential unfairness of a unilateral decision made by the judges to use monies that we had appropriated in a limited capacity to fully fund probation officials, including those of the juvenile court in Douglas County, notwithstanding what appeared to be clear legislative intent to the contrary and how, in a sense, if we, as Senator Goll states, permit those judges to get away with it, we open the door for all kinds of future deficiency appropriations that are forced upon us when others make unilateral decisions and we are simply compelled after the fact to make a judgment call as to whether or not to recognize that unilateral decision. I think that particular argument that Senator Goll presents and others have presented have some merit, in fact, have considerable merit. The difficulty I am having with the argument, however, is my memory that year in and year out when you and I adopt basic appropriation bills as each session comes to an end, many times our appropriation leader, Senator Jerome Warner, will indicate either publicly or privately that very likely, notwithstanding the appropriation bill we have just adopted, we are going to see a deficiency appropriation in the following session to pick up the costs of such things as Special Education, in particular, to pick such things as the cost of Medicaid, in particular, or to pick up the costs of such things as maybe the homestead exemption, in particular. In other words, there have always been times in our life when in adopting a basic appropriational document we know that there are some areas that have been shortchanged, so to speak, in that appropriation bill and that we undoubtedly will have to pick up that shortchange in a subsequent legislative session. And I think we have accepted that practice. We certainly have recognized that practice. Now, what we are being asked to do today is qualitatively different from that in this respect. When the original appropriations bill was adopted during the last session, it specifically did not contemplate this kind of a deficiency that we are picking up. In other words, there was never anybody who should have had a sense that this was a deficiency that was going to be called for in a subsequent session. So that is a qualitative different from our other conduct in expending money previously but then knowing that we would probably have to do a deficit appropriation or deficiency appropriation in a subsequent