

But especially in this area, they want complete autonomy over mental health funds so they can shift them as they see fit. By the same token, they really have no long range plans, Senator Lewis, as to how they propose to dovetail the Regional Centers together with the Community Mental Health Centers on the decentralized basis. And we've taken....I've taken a lot of heat in this area. I'm not opposed to decentralization. I want to see how it's going to work. And I don't think magically the wands we now have, Community Mental Health Centers per se period, everything is fine. That is not the history of many other states. So, what we have tried to do in this appropriations bill is to earmark so much money for Regional Centers. And then, the balance of that money can move towards the Community Mental Health Centers as they develop. Now, I'm not sure this answers your question. This allows the administration some flexibility but does not allow them as much flexibility as they want. They want total control over mental health funds and we've refused to give this to them. And I would say one other thing, as long as I'm on my feet, tying in with part of what Senator Carpenter said, he and I may disagree on amounts, but I don't think we disagree on one basic and key point. And I'm going to alert you to this because this is a constitutional question. The Governor has the right under the constitution as he sees it to item veto--the Legislature according to some is forced to take, let's assume on this bill, for instance, he vetoed--crossed out "change ten different items". We're told when LB1054 comes back to us with ten items of veto, we either override all those ten items or don't override and lose them all. I maintain that we can fight on the basis of each item. And in that respect, I think this is what we ought to do. Senator Carpenter, I....detect you don't agree with me but the Attorney General's opinion says that, as I read it, that they think that we don't have this right. They can't prove this and the only way I know it can be proven is through a court decision.

PRESIDENT: Well, the next one up, Senator Carpenter, Senator Clark, I have to call on Senator Clark unless he wants to defer to you. I trust you'll keep your remarks in your usual brief manner.

SENATOR CARPENTER: I'll be very brief. The reason he.... Senator Marvel and I disagree because I think it's fine, we have to take it all or none. Because if everybody in this Body, depending on the area they come from, has something in that, then we're going to override it. And that's the way it ought to be. This is a Body which you have to compromise. We have to help each other. We have to respect each other's judgment to the point that knowing why they're here. And if we've got LB1053 or LB1054, LB1055, which every one participates to some reasonable extent based upon the need, then we're going to override these things if the Governor of this State scales down for no other reason except he's more concerned about only the tax rates and not the need and I think that's bad policy, bad philosophy, and I think it'll eventually live to haunt him.

PRESIDENT: Senator Clark.

SENATOR CLARK: Well, I would like to admonish people to really read this bill when it comes out. If they would follow it, they would find that I know in a four years of the Budget Committee, this is the first time that we've ever had enough staff to go into the budget of each individual code agency or