nay. Record the vote.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 2 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: The motion carries. Debate ceases. Senator Wesely, you may close.

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, obviously you're not real interested in discussing the merits of the issue. You're probably not very interested in the specific facts involved with the amendment but I'm going to try and express those anyway and hope that maybe some of you will listen. First off, Senator Cullan's discussion about Bryan emphasizes why you need to adopt the amendment and not why the amendment shouldn't be adopted. It is obvious that the appeal panel that we're talking about that is consumer dominated that Senator Cullan talks about is, in fact, provider dominated. You can talk about a majority of consumers but in every case we have seen it seems as though the providers get more their way under that system than the other side would be, the consumer that we're talking about, and so the Bryan project and the increased costs that you're talking about there wouldn't be there if the Bryan project had followed the Health Department proposals and had not been overturned by the appeals panel. They talked about limiting the interest rate on the bonds. A lot of the delay that was talked about and the impact there was caused by the Bryan Hospital people themselves so they are using certificate of need as a scapegoat. They are using it as an excuse for some of the costs that they would otherwise have incurred anyway and, in fact, if the Health Department had been able to get their way I think you would see the scaled back project that would have met the needs that were legitimate for Bryan and would not have been wasteful and extravagant and expensive as perhaps it will be under the proposal that the appeal panel approved. So I think that is the reason why we should adopt this amendment, not a reason why we should not. Again, I want to read to you from the people that make up this committee now, their comments in August of 1980 where they said at the August 7, 1980 meeting of this advisory committee, they passed a resolution by a unanimous vote of those members present to have the committee removed from the Nebraska Health Care Certificate of Need Act. The reasons are contained in the attached minutes and these minutes outline the following reasons. Confidence should be placed in HSA reviews and recommendations. Unfortunately they have been eliminated and not much confidence there. The review period is too time consuming and that is what Senator Cullan is proposing in this bill, a very time consuming review process and the involvement of the committee only adds to that time consumption . The applicant is subject to several levels of review which become re-