

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 25, 2003 LB 667

would like to ask Senator Jensen if he can look at this part with me. It's on page 14.

SENATOR JENSEN: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Starting in line 19, "A practitioner"...oh, let me go up here so we can tie it in. "A pharmacist," beginning in line 17, "A pharmacist may drug product select except when: A practitioner designates that drug product selection is not permitted by specifying in his or her own handwriting on the face of the prescription or by telephonic or electronic communication that there shall be no drug product selection. For written prescriptions, the practitioner shall specify on the prescription the phrase 'no drug product selection,' 'dispense as written,' 'brand medically necessary,' or 'no generic substitution' or the notation, "...and these are letters, each of which has a period following it,..." 'N.D.P.S,' 'B.M.N.,' or 'D.A.W.' or words or notations of similar import to indicate that drug product selection is not permitted." Now here's what I'm looking at. These abbreviations coincide with the phrases that were mentioned above but they are not in the same order. The first phrase says no drug product selection. And the first abbreviation is N.D.P.S, which is all right. The second phrase is dispense as written, but the second abbreviation is D.M.N. (sic--B.M.N.) It ought to be D.A.W., so that the second abbreviation goes with the second phrase. The third phrase is brand medically necessary, but the abbreviation for that, B.M.N., is in the second position. So the positions of B.M.N. and D.A.W. should be reversed or the phrases, dispense as written and brand medically necessary, should be reversed so there is consistency. But then I find that the phrase, no generic substitution, is given short shrift because there is no abbreviation for that. The abbreviation for that should be N.G.S. I have a problem in that I read bills and I read amendments and I probably shouldn't. And maybe what I'm dealing with is inconsequential but it's not inconsequential to me. This is something that I can talk to Senator Jensen about later, and I'm not going to offer an amendment. But I think since we're drafting legislation and we're giving a phrase and then an abbreviation, that there ought to be a correlation in the placement, plus there should be an abbreviation for no generic