

don't understand why that is deleted.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Well, Senator, you can do it either way, and Senator Hannibal makes a point. I want to make this clear that once we approve the project, anything else is redundant and we don't need to think that the CON committee is going to give any real concern to the project if we have said go ahead, because what will happen will be exactly what has happened between last year and this year. In the event that everything goes to hell in a basket, they will just come back to this Legislature and say, well, we had to go overboard a little bit, had to spend some more money, and if everything else fails, the bonding system isn't there, we will go ahead and we'll pay for the project out of general tax funds. I can see where Senator Wesely is concerned because he thinks that I am saying we don't need the CON. That is...that is a given, that is a given to put it in there that this is subject to the approval of the CON committee after we have said, yes, we need the project, yes, we need the parking lot, yes, we need the operating rooms, yes, we need...we go into great detail. We go into considerable detail, central sterile supply facilities, loading dock/warehouse facilities, hospital and clinic space renovations, what more is there left. We have outlined it in great detail and said all of these things are needed. Now I challenge any member of this body to stand here and tell me, with the possible exception of the parking lot, that all of those things are definitely needed, Senator Wesely. You can tack on...you can amend the amendment if you want to to reinstate the language relative to the CON but I don't believe it makes any difference, because in the first two sections, one and two, we have already said, notwithstanding, notwithstanding, we approve of the project. So that is my argument, Senator Wesely. I have no objection if you want to amend the amendment to reinstate the CON language but I think it is redundant.

SENATOR WESELY: I understand your point, Senator Schmit, and as I said, last year I did support your similar amendment. I was very concerned about the influencing of the review process by this Legislature, and I thought your amendment last year was appropriate, and I think the thrust of what you are trying to do is appropriate again. I think we are in a position to make the signal that needs to be sent is are we willing to allow the financing that is being asked for here, and I think that is absolutely the case. But, again, the question is that is this cost effective, is this necessary, is this the right thing to