

ments. He said they do not belong in a certificate of need type of legislation. While I would suggest that cost containment issues do belong in certificate of need legislation and I would suggest also that when you look at the past record that we have established with certificate of need, certainly there needs to be something done other than what has happened so far and I think that Senator Cullan's amendment is not going to be helpful in that area so I would ask you to vote against the motion to suspend the rules at this time.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Beutler. The question has been called for. Do I see five hands? I do. The question is, shall debate cease. All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Record the vote.

CLERK: 26 ayes, 7 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: The motion carries. Debate ceases. Senator Cullan, you may close on your motion to suspend the rules.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'm not a person that supports suspending the rules frequently. I oppose it most of the time. I'm also one that is very reluctant to put a motion on the desk to suspend the rules but when there was talk about tying up the legislative session I did put one on the bill and prior to that point in time I would tell you that there were five amendments pending to LB 378. My motion was up before Senator Higgins so out of fairness to Senator Higgins to give her a shot at her nursing home bill I pulled my motion to suspend so that she could consider her issue. So I think I have been fair as I could be in allowing discussion, free and open discussion on LB 378 on certificate of need. It is probably the single most debated issue of the 1982 legislative session and I think I've not tried to stifle debate at all and I have been willing to respond to questions throughout this process and tried to discuss the issues as best I could but there has to come a point in time where debate ceases. Senator Schmit's proposal, the one which he evidently has circulated now and is a large proposal, raises issues that I have not seen before and that this Legislature has not seen before. It raises important substantive issues. I'm not sure that I disagree with all of them. I think that next year, hopefully Senator Schmit and I will have the opportunity to cosponsor some legislation in the area of insurance and some of the areas that Senator Schmit would like to work in but I do not believe it is appropriate to attach an amendment to LB 378 on the fifty-eighth day of the session. I would tell you this. Obviously I have an interest in LB 378 and obviously