

competently when to use and when not to use these dangerous drugs like steroids, and you will note that on the Technical Review Committee whose charge is only to make recommendations to the director, there were seven members, and the vote was split. It was split four to two with the chairman of the committee abstaining after all the arguments had been heard, and let's look at the composition of the four who voted in favor. Well, the four who voted in favor were an optometrist, that is no surprise; an optician, that is no surprise; a consumer, we don't know who that person was or what influenced his decision; and a professor of dental pharmacology, a professor of dental pharmacology on the committee. The dissenters were an ophthalmologist and, most important, a pharmacist. A pharmacist on the committee who understands what steroids are, who understands what these other dangerous drugs are, and when they should be administered and when they should not be administered, dissented and, finally, when the last vote was taken, the chairman of the committee, a dentist, abstained, abstained, and when this amendment was offered to the committee itself, the record clearly reflects that some members of the committee felt that it was beyond their expertise, some members of the committee felt it was beyond the charge of the committee, and there were some abstentions at that particular vote and really a general feeling by at least some of the members of the committee that they were not competent to make this decision. So, once again, I think it is important to understand that...

SENATOR CARSTEN: One minute.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: ...the review process was not, as the proponents have indicated, complied with or satisfied. Indeed, the review process was undertaken and the recommendation of the review process was against approval of this bill. And, as Senator Wesely indicates, since we have been here, since several of us have been here, since 1979 this has been offered, and it has been defeated. This is about the third time I think that this bill has been before the full Legislature in the eight years that Senator Johnson, Senator Wesely and others of us have been here, and the fact that it keeps coming back doesn't mean it was right. The fact that it keeps coming back, in my view, means that the Legislature exercised proper judgment in previous years in declining to pass or declining to override a veto of this particular measure. Thank you,