

committee amendments and then brings us back a little bit closer to where the optometrists are, but does not go back as far as Senator Moore would have us, where the optometrists would have us. It still maintains supervision by an ophthalmologist. That means a very high level of oversight by an ophthalmologist over the operation of an optometrist in dealing with glaucoma. It is a higher level than consultation and collaboration. We also restrict the fact that the ophthalmologist providing the oversight has to be in Nebraska, cannot be an out-of-state ophthalmologist. That is objected to by the optometrists, but I feel is important. We also make it clear that there are periodic site visits not...the optometrists want no site visits in the original language. We want periodic site visits. In addition, we want training of the optometrists, that's all included in this amendment. In addition, we have the superficial clarification of foreign bodies that can be removed, and we also deal with the oral pharmaceuticals being overseen by the optometrist. There were questions by Senator Robinson about the oversight involved here by the ophthalmologist. And again I want to clarify the situation, want to respond to that specific question earlier. Oral ocular pharmaceutical agents are now, excuse me, not allowed by statute for optometrists. This bill would allow it. We require oversight by the ophthalmologist, except for analgesics...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR WESELY: ...and anti-infective pharmaceutical agents. Otherwise, other oral ocular pharmaceutical agents are supervised by an ophthalmologist, under this amendment. The topical ocular pharmaceutical agents are currently allowed under the law to be used by optometrists, but not for the treatment of glaucoma. The bill allows those topical ocular pharmaceutical agents to now be used also for the treatment of glaucoma, and those are under the oversight and supervision of an ophthalmologist. What I am suggesting again is that contrary to the view that the committee amendments were a compromise, now being reneged upon, is that there was no compromise, there is no compromise, and there is unlikely to be a compromise because of the different views here. What you need to do is judge what's fair and best in the interest of the general public, and I feel comfortable that this amendment brings us back to a more balanced decision in this area, and I would ask your...

PRESIDENT MOUL: Time.