

issues, one of the approaches, as a matter of policy, that the committee discussed was, as you well know, these two motions as well as two others earlier adopted, were the result of motions on the floor in which additions to the budget were made. And, obviously, as you will recall, the addition of those funds were not totally supported by members of the committee but certainly were not included in the original budget. Also, it was a fact, however, that we had some \$5 million in the original budget that was available for such floor amendments so that there was the opportunity for the body as a whole to make adjustments and not be placed in the position that any change in the budget proposed by the committee could only be done with effect on tax rates or at the expense of taking some other activity out. As the bills were drafted, the two areas in which there were amendments on the floor could not be separately treated and that was the University of Nebraska Technical Agricultural School at Curtis and the addition of the program for nursing to be located at Scottsbluff. Those, as a matter of drafting of the bills and by virtue of the way the vetoes were done, were, in effect, included or swept in with any override whatsoever affecting either the University of Nebraska at Lincoln or affecting the Medical Center at Omaha. These two programs though were left and so to adequately explain, it was the majority vote of the committee of one of giving priority of status in terms of consideration that this motion be placed. It was not a motion of recommendation that is a majority of the members recommending that the override be done, but it was a motion that it should be properly before the body in this order because it represented additions to the budget that the body as a whole had suggested. With that, I would like to speak specifically to the two. In the case of community mental retardation, as we all are aware there has been an ongoing concern now for at least two years on the manner in which not only were budgets submitted, both by the regions, by the Department of Institutions, but for that matter the manner in which allocation by the Legislature was done needed to be revised. During that process, a formula that creates both need measurement, which still could be argued with and a formula for distribution, whatever level of funding was appropriate or felt to be appropriate by the Legislature could be used, was arrived at and there is discussion as to the appropriateness of that yet. But the motion that was adopted on the floor did keep intact the concept of that formula that was included in the appropriation bill last session. The level of funding of \$1,270,000 resulted in all regions having some increase but it particularly addressed the unique inequities that occurred in region 3 and 4 for a number of reasons.