

will not and I think I'd like to have...I know it is difficult right now to look through that but if you do have a chance you ought to read the last three...page three and four of the handout and then if you will look at the chart at the back it talks about a comparison of estimated cost. We are talking about quite a bit of money in this proposal and I think it should be pointed out that when LB 378A came up I mentioned the fact that the \$20,000 that was allocated from cash funds was not going to cover the cost. The fiscal note, if you'll look at your bill, shows that the fiscal office sees a \$40,000 cost whereas the Health Department thought it would be about a \$60,000 cost so the \$20,000 allocated in the A bill from the cash fund is far from being enough to cover the cost involved with this new process that Senator Cullan is proposing. The reason that there is no general fund monies, and Senator Warner and I cosponsored an amendment to LB 378A to put in the general fund money that was called for in the fiscal note, is quite clearly because Governor Thone has said he will veto any additional A bill expenditures above his budget and so the health care lobby and Senator Cullan were wise enough to recognize this and did not include any general fund coverage of the cost. That does not mean, however, there is not the additional cost and that does not mean that there won't be, somehow, an additional expense the Health Department and the taxpayers are going to have to pick up. So I am saying that instead of incurring this additional cost, let's go to this other system that will be less expensive and let's also recognize the fact that this system is going to be more streamlined than the one Senator Cullan is proposing. The proposal I have, this amendment to the bill would make it a quicker process and a clearer process to follow in receiving a certificate of need. When the bill was first heard in January the big controversy was, well, we've got this big certificate of need process and we've got to streamline it. That is what LB 378 is all about. Well in its present form it really isn't streamlined very much at all except for the fact that they eliminate a lot of different projects that normally would have been reviewed but for those that are reviewed it is a longer, more cumbersome process that is more costly. So when you talk about the concept of streamlining the regulatory process it is this amendment that streamlines the process, not the current version of LB 378. And I think as we talk a bit about the concept of the advantages to the providers, LB 378's process is really the crux of the matter. By having a 4-3 split on this review committee making the decision there, we have found that these citizen committees are prone, even though they may have a majority of consumers, prone to support the provider position more often than not and that is actually going to be much easier for the providers to get approval of their project proposals under this system than would be the case with the