

1 why did they do it. The reasons may be perfectly valid.

2 MR. GENTRY: The reasons are short. Back in
3 the Fourth Report substantively the proposed section
4 eliminates the distinction between proposal made
5 between appropriations exceeding and those not exceeding
6 the next preceding appropriation for the same purpose.
7 In the opinion of the Committee, the fundamental purpose
8 of this restriction is preservation of legislative
9 power to make necessary provision for maintaining the
10 state government and its institutions. The present
11 provision appears, at least indirectly, to be an effort
12 to employ a constitutional provision to restrict the
13 Legislature in the exercise of its judgment in matters
14 of prime legislative concern. We didn't take a fresh
15 look at this. That is why I am referring back.

16 MR. CASE: The effect of it would be not
17 so much, I think, in perhaps appropriations exceeding
18 the last previous one where you had a previous one, but
19 new appropriations, items in the budget bill which were
20 totally new. Apparently the present Constitution could
21 be read to mean that those kinds of appropriations are