

pharmacies who do not wish to see mail-order pharmacies get an advantage, and the insurance companies who want to allow a lower cost alternative.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If the mail-order pharmacies provide these medications or drugs at a lower cost than the resident pharmacist, is that harmful to the consumer, by that I meant the person who has to make use of these drugs?

SENATOR WESELY: The lower cost should result in lower premiums having to be paid for the health insurance that covers their health.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Now I would like to ask Senator Janssen a question or two based on some things I heard him say earlier, which I don't understand at all. I thought I heard you discussing the right of people to have as many choices in the use of a pharmacy or a pharmacist as possible. Did I understand you to talk about people's choices in this regard?

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Janssen.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Yes, I did, Senator Chambers, on the choice of whether they wanted to go to an out-of-state mail-order pharmacy for their pharmaceutical needs, or from their local pharmacy that is in their town or in their block in the city or so on.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And is it your feeling that they should have that choice?

SENATOR JANSSEN: Yes, I believe they should.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Would this bill restrict that choice in any way?

SENATOR JANSSEN: Yes, by the amount of the copay, the exuberant copay that has to be paid to the local pharmacy, which is imposed by the insurance company. If they go to a mail-order pharmacy, they get a 90-day supply of maintenance drug with a copay of \$2. If they choose to go to their local pharmacy, they can only get a 30-day supply and the copay is \$9, so you see that is quite a bit difference.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: It is \$27 versus \$2.