

SENATOR HALL: What's the rationale for that?

SENATOR WESELY: Well, I...

SENATOR HALL: I mean I know when I go get my life...if I get additional life insurance as I did a couple years ago, they sent out a nurse to come draw blood, normal operating procedure when you...you reach my age I guess, for purposes of life insurance, and it was an RN. Under this provision the maintenance technician could come out and draw blood as long as he was, you know, working under the scope of that...that RN, or a doctor, or anyone. I mean, isn't that really what it's saying? Or am I all wet on this issue?

SENATOR WESELY: No.

SENATOR HALL: Because if I am I'll go away.

SENATOR WESELY: No, I think, you know, essentially it's a pretty wide open authorization as long as you're under, you know, directly under the protocol and oversight of an authorized practitioner you're able to...just about anybody would be able to do this.

SENATOR HALL: And my question is is there any special training that would go...that's mandated by this? I mean, it's one thing to be...to be trained, be under their supervision and be given the authority. That probably makes sense, especially in the more rural areas of the state. But to just hire somebody, not have any training mandated, not have any kind of oversight or regulation built in, but allow for basically a pass through of that...that right or that license to operate, which is what I perceive this to be, is much more than...than that. And if there are no checks and balances, there's no training involved, what are we allowing here? What kind of problems are we going to run into down the road?

SENATOR WESELY: Well, those are legitimate questions, Senator Hall. And, again, they were reviewed by various people and felt to be adequately addressed with this amendment. The original LB 602, I've had a chance to look back to answer your earlier question, was a registration scheme to deal with phlebotomy.

SENATOR HALL: Right.