

actuality, it does not. So I would ask you not to consider this as a credible report. Again I mention, it was presented to the Technical Review Committee and our committee rejected it. I oppose the amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Thank you, Senator Chronister. Senator Wesely, please.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Mr. President and members, I would rise to discuss the 407 process, and a bit of my feelings on this amendment, and on the bill, LB 131. This issue has been before the body since 1978. I first came in in 1979 and was in the middle of a fight over that issue, whether or not we should use drugs through optometrists for diagnostic purposes. That battle resulted in the success of the optometrists. They received that sanction and then they were able to go forward and have done a pretty good job with that effort. I have been pleased with the success. But at the time we passed that legislation, it was stated clearly that that was not a domino effect, that that privilege was not going to lead eventually to them coming back with requests for the use of drugs for therapeutic uses, again recognize the difference between diagnostic and therapeutic uses, diagnostic drugs being less critical, less severe, less harmful than therapeutic potentially could be. Well, within a few years of passing that bill, the optometrists were back asking for the therapeutic use of drugs. Now, at the time there were only a couple of states that had allowed for it. We are now up to a handful of states that have allowed for it. I am not sure that there is even 10 that have taken this route. At the time we took this step to allow for diagnostic use of drugs, we were behind. Many states had already provided for this activity. My position in the committee was to allow this bill out of committee, to vote for it, so that you would all have a chance to consider it, also to get attacked from both sides probably and lobbied heavily, and I am sure you don't appreciate that but this is a close call. This bill is not an easy one to make a decision on and I have wavered on it. I have supported it and now I am standing before you opposing it, and I am opposing it not based on the fact that it doesn't have some merit because it does, there is some potential good out of this bill, and at some point it may be the right thing to do. I am suggesting perhaps to error, and error may be in order today either way you go, error on the side of caution. Now, I got up here and I opposed a lot of the licensure