

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

March 25, 2003 LB 667

substitute a generic drug of an equivalent nature. But that's strike one, Senator Chambers. I wanted to continue to ask Senator Jensen a couple of questions, if he would. And, again, Senator Jensen, my concern is is that we have a number of seniors in Nebraska, a significant number of seniors in Nebraska, and the mail order portion of this amendment I think, you know, will...if we change it, it impacts a significant number of people in Nebraska, and I just want to make sure that we're not changing it in a way that protects a particular industry and that it makes it more favorable to our constituents, that they can still get the cost benefits from these mail order services and yet still be protected. And could you kind of reiterate, Senator Jensen, if you would yield, exactly what this does?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator.

SENATOR BOURNE: Because, again, I see some language in here that requires an employment of a full-time pharmacist. And I am wondering if that's protecting the pharmaceutical industry or the pharmacist industry or if it is protecting the individuals. And, again, if it's going to add cost to the mail order program, is that something that we want to do?

SENATOR JENSEN: Yes, and thank you, Senator Bourne. And I, also, would not like to increase the cost to any citizen in this state, and we were told at the hearing by the pharmacists that this should not affect the cost to anyone receiving drugs in the state. It was supported certainly by the pharmacists, but it was also by HHS who really felt that this...that they really didn't have an opportunity. There were some cases of some drugs coming in that were wrong and they didn't have an opportunity to go address that issue. So this allows them to do that. But I can check into that further but certainly at the hearing there was no indication, as a matter of fact they said, no, it would not increase the cost.

SENATOR BOURNE: So you had testimony at the hearing that that cost would not be increased but consumer protection features to our seniors would be.