

of Senator Clark, and I would be the first to admit that I being a lay person am not terribly familiar with drugs. It was my understanding, Senator Clark, that the intent of LB 9 was to allow optometrists to diagnose, and diagnosis only, and I see that reference throughout the bill, and I feel very comfortable with that reference numerous said throughout the bill. What bothers me is the concept of emergency reasons only. Now this doesn't follow in my concept of routine eye examination where they'd use a drop for diagnosis of glaucoma, or whatever, and so I have two questions, Senator Clark, the first is, where does this element of emergency come in to routine eye examinations for diagnosis only, number one, and number two, I would like you to expand on other types of diseases of the eye that they would be looking for with the exception of glaucoma.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Clark, do you yield to those two questions?

SENATOR CLARK: Well, he's asked two questions. In the first place what he has asked is why miotics are for emergency use only. I thought I just got through explaining that. Maybe, perhaps, he wasn't listening to it. Dr. Smith was asked about miotics, and he said what would happen if you would have narrow angular glaucoma, whatever in the world that is, and it were induced by a mydriatic, we would have to use pilocarpine they say as a miotic in order to take care of that for emergency use only. Now, this is not treatment, but it could be construed as treatment, and Dr. Smith said, well, of course, if you didn't use that you could be sued for malpractice...if you didn't do it for emergency use only the same as anything else for emergency use only. So he was the one that brought the subject up, not me, and he said he was very comfortable with it for emergency use only in the bill. Now what diseases they're looking for, there's many diseases in the bill that define of the eye, including brain tumor. They can see that in the eye. Now when they find any disease of the eye, and what these diseases are, I certainly don't know, but whenever they see anything in the eye that is not normal, they are then sent to not only an ophthalmologist...it could be a brain surgeon or someone else, to go into the details and treatment of whatever disease it is. The bill specifically says they cannot treat, and if they would treat, someone asked me that also, Senator Dworak, if they would treat what would happen. It's like anything else that happens...if you go beyond the scope of your license you get your license removed, whether you be an M.D., an ophthalmologist or an optometrist, or anyone else, you get your license removed. I hope that would answer your question.