

contact lenses have been in existence why Mr. Torrison has been fitting them as an optician. I have heard from him and other opticians who understandably object strongly to our passing or considering at the final stage of debate in this Legislature on this particular piece of legislation an amendment that would deprive them of 30 or 40 percent of the business that constitutes their livelihood. Now without reaching the merits of whether or not opticians should be able to fit contact lenses, I think at the very least we should have a committee hearing on this particular issue. The opticians should have an opportunity to come down along with the ophthalmologists, the physicians who I understand support the position of the opticians on this issue, and be able to make their case before the Public Health and Welfare Committee to rebut the case that I know a lot of optometrists have been making to us privately in our offices over the last three weeks. I don't think it is good practice on Final Reading to ask this Legislature to impose a substantive change of this nature which, as I indicate, it is my impression would take business away from a whole category of professionals in the State of Nebraska that have been fitting and in other respects treating patients with contact lenses and that have been doing that for a great number of years. I would be interested in hearing from the proponents of this measure as to whether or not this would not in effect do that and whether or not it is not appropriate in those circumstances to have a public hearing before we consider a change of this magnitude as I indicated again on Final Reading. So until those concerns of mine are clarified, I would oppose this amendment and would ask my colleagues to do the same. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR LAMB: Senator Cullan.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I would also rise to oppose any amendments to LB 449 at this point in time. I would like to remind the Legislature that this bill is a sunset proposal and that also the Board of Optometry must if it is to stay in existence, this bill must pass, it must pass with 33 votes. I wonder how many of us are going to be willing to support changes in the scope of the practice of these three professions made in a sunset bill, and I think there is some risk inherent in adoption of this amendment to the optometrists that the sunset bill might not be enacted with a sufficient number of votes to have the emergency clause on it and that could be a problem. I think that it is very unwise to try major amendments on