

officially is that we do not override any vetoes primarily because somewhat of the uncertainty of our...of the economic future. We have a balanced budget at this point above the minimum reserve as presented to us by the Governor. It takes into account somewhat of the decline in revenue as we had on April 1st, which was through the month of March. We felt it was prudent to continue on this course and so at this point we are not recommending any overrides at all. I will speak to some perhaps more in general later, but it is extremely difficult to start picking and choosing. There is good rationale for any and all. We felt that because of the way the budget was presented, it probably does distribute some of the cuts across the board fairly uniformly, at least from many perspectives, obviously, not all. Everyone is going to have some of the issues they think that should be restored perhaps, but once we start that, it easily can turn into a free-fall from my opinion. The one recommendation that we are making for an override is on page 55 of the amendment that has to do with an earmark, and I will try to explain it. I don't have anything passed out. It is a little difficult. It is in the Department of Public Institutions, under Program 355, under mental health. It is a little difficult to explain, but in the Governor's veto, he vetoed a million dollars out of the General Funds in the mental health aid package. We are not disturbing the million dollars. But in the process, he also took the earmark that we had in there for community-based mental health programs and took away that earmark for community-based mental health programs. It was the sense of the committee that we would leave the cut intact, and that we would...but we would remove the earmark so that community-based programs would not suffer unduly. It assures that those funds then would go to the mental health programs in the community-based area, and the Governor had, and on the other side of the coin is he vetoed it, the earmark, so that there was more flexibility within DPI's budget to take the cut, but we felt that it should...but the committee felt that we should not balance the budget on the backs of community-based programs which we are leading to and growing and expanding. It will probably be a little more difficult for DPI to make the cut, but, at least, it will be not at the expense of community-based mental health programs. Once again, it is on page 55 of your amendment, Section 93 or Section 98, excuse me, Agency 25, and as I am explaining, it is really not clear about the earmark. If there is questions on it I will be happy to add or expand on exactly what line it is, but it does reduce...it simply takes