

motion has been echoed before, I just want to reiterate it, in that we have...DPI has a large budget in this particular area. They have got a large budget in other areas. I think they have the flexibility now, at least, even though there is going to be less money over all, at least where the money was intended to go, which, in fact, in some regions did not occur, but where it was intended to go, at least those, the local level, the community level will be able to make sure that they have those dollars available to them. Now I think it's important, and as I indicated earlier, that in some areas of the state, obviously not all regions, but some areas of the state, there are some inherent conflicts between DPI and community-based programs, and I think that in this particular case we need to fall down on the side of providing the flexibility for the community-based to continue to operate as they have this past year with the additional funds, and that that flexibility at the state level within the department, at the state level, is not critical given the amount of money that we are talking about here and also is not critical relative to them being able to maintain the intent of the Legislature's actions. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Maurstad. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. I just want to reiterate some of the points that Senator Warner and others have made. Part of things that we've done this session, whether we voted for or against them, is we've allowed, we are basically saying to the agency heads to put their best minds together, whether we can argue they are great minds or not great minds is not the point, but put the best intelligence they have, put it together, and try to make some new things work, and particularly on LB 1044 when we combined the DPI, Social Services, Department of Health, OJS, and so on. They need to have the flexibility as we've tried to give the counties on the property tax, as we've tried to give the cities, as we've tried to give school districts, as we've tried to give agencies on LB 1044 the flexibility to make what we're asking them to do work. So I will be voting no on this. This proposition, this portion of the overrides, (a), because it doesn't have a fiscal effect, but, (b), because I do believe that for the agencies to do what we are asking them to do, the most flexibility we can give them is the name of the game I think for the rest of this fiscal year going into