

developed the legislative muscle to raid, in a sense, health care dollars that everyone must pay. It is hard sometimes, to define where the line is drawn between a practitioner art that simply wants to get in on the health care dollar, or a practitioner art that really and truly is competent to expand their scope of practice. I, for one, and some others who maybe won't be speaking today, have not been convinced that that latter case exists. So I'd encourage you not to support...or to advance 131.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Mr. Clerk, I understand we have a motion.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Chambers would move to amend the bill. (Chambers amendment appears on page 1143 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I again will call your attention to page 2 of the bill, in lines 12 and 13, I want to strike the words "or refer for consultation of treatment". Then in line 12, after "diagnose", strike the comma, insert the word "and". The language would then read "to diagnose and treat any abnormal condition of the human eye or lid". This, to me, is what they are concerned about in this bill, being able to diagnose and treat. I don't think the definition of optometry should include these words that I've stricken. If you look further up in the bill, starting at line 4, you find these words, "For the purpose of this act, the practice of optometry is defined as being one or a combination of the following without the use of surgery." Then you would find the words "refer for consultation or treatment". Even in the legal profession, where they are very jealous about anybody doing anything that a lawyer does without being accused of the unauthorized practice of law, they do not call referring a person to a lawyer the unauthorized practice of law. So I think these words are overbroad and totally unnecessary, and it would include people who are doing legal things into a category where they have no business and thereby make them subject to a sanction for practicing optometry without a license. An optometrist, obviously, can make a referral. But I don't think that a person making a referral, when such person is not an optometrist, should be considered to be practicing optometry. And, based on the definition of the practice of