

a new service or substantial change of service would be set at \$50,000. He is willing, in this amendment to the amendment, to raise that level to \$500,000.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Baack, excuse me. (Gavel.)

SENATOR BAACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This would raise the level from \$50,000 to \$500,000. Another way of looking at it though is to say that what it does is it raises the thresholds that we have established in 429 from \$900,000 down to \$500,000. That is the two different ways of looking at this amendment. But I think we need to, and I'll be the first to admit that going from 50,000 to \$500,000 is certainly a move in the right direction, but the...I don't think, you know, I don't want to get into an auction on these numbers in here. That's not what we're out here for. I think that we have looked at the thresholds and we have put some very, very reasonable thresholds into 429 and this is done with some reasoning and we didn't do this just by picking a number out of the sky, and I think that...and that's why originally the bill was at 1.2 million, or 1.5 million, we were willing to lower that to 900,000 seeing that we could go to that level and still make the process work properly. So I rise in opposition to this amendment to the amendment. And I think that we need to look a little bit more at the amendment also because...and we'll probably get into this as we discuss the totality of Senator Wesely's amendment, but one of the main features of the disagreement between Senator Wesely and myself, of course, is the list. And if we're going to include this list as services that no matter what costs, they are going to be reviewed, at that point it makes the numbers that we're talking about here, the 50,000, the 500,000, 900,000, whatever number you want to put in there, it makes those absolutely meaningless because we're going to have all of these other services that are going to be absolutely reviewed regardless of the cost. And he's got a very long list of things that have to be included regardless of cost and I don't think that that's a good move. I don't think we ought to put that kind of a list into statute saying that these services regardless of cost are going to be reviewed. What we have here is, we're getting now into the discussion of the haves versus the "have nots" and you're dealing in the competition between hospitals. The haves, the ones that have all these services now like having the list in there so that any new competition would certainly have to go through the certificate of need process before they could offer this service also so we're getting now