the committee process, bypassing the typical method in which we deal with issues, and coming straight to General File and putting before you amendments that are essentially a new bill. It appears to me that this would totally bypass the typical legislative process we follow in trying to deal with issues. It is early in the session. There was no need for this expedient action at this time. It appears to me far more prudent to take some time to look over these amendments and to discuss them in committee and then act upon them at that time. I think that this is definitely an approach that needs to be rejected because what it does is it starts setting a precedent for the rest of the session for bypassing the committees and moving straight to the floor on amendments that are too major to be really considered germane and appropriate. As far as his amendments, the substance of them is incorrect and I think misguided in a number of different ways. First off, he questions I think in essence the whole CON process. In the handout that you have, each of you got one, goes back to 1979 when this whole issue started and the bill was passed in the first place. For new members in the Legislature, I passed out a publication from the federal government on "Nebraska Gets Its First Certificate of Need Law". For those who are veteran members who were around in 1979, I didn't pass that around because you were here at that instance when we passed that legislation but we received national recognition in 1979 for the bill that we passed and the excellent form it was in and were recognized nationally for it. Now if you want a copy of that article, you can have one, and again, I gave it to all the new members of the Legislature so you would know what you missed in 1979, and let me say that this was one of the biggest issues of that year and perhaps of a number of years. It was termed in light of a lobbyist, special interest fight versus the public interest-legislator fight, and it turned out that the public won and the legislators won and the lobbyists lost. Well, they haven't forgot that and they are back today with this amendment and this bill and trying to win back what they lost in 1979. In 1980 and in 1981, this issue came up in not quite as serious a fashion and so we basically have been rolled back to 1979 and forgotten what it was all about at that time. And I am hoping to reacquaint you with the issues involved and with the seriousness of this debate and Senator Cullan has started the process with this amendment and I think that we should discuss it fully. And my feeling is at this time that whatever you may think about those amendments or whatever amendments you have made on those amendments, I am assuming that they are going to be adopted and I guess I am going to be a pessimist at this point that the lobbies have been working and that those votes are probably there,