

essence, does it put a burden on the patient that, okay, that you go to the optometrist, because of the nature of what we are allowing them to do in this piece of legislation, do you then, I guess, require two visits? Because we are allowing them to do more things, steroids are specifically excluded from the provision, are we then forcing them to, even though we allow the optometrists to perform those kinds of procedures, we are now taking away or by excluding steroids forcing that patient to see more than one health care professional? Would they then be referred to an ophthalmologist, is my question, and I guess it just goes back to the whole issue of why we exclude steroids from this provision?

SENATOR MOORE: The simple answer to your question would they be referred to an ophthalmologist, the answer would be yes. Probably Senator Wesely can talk about the steroid issue better than I can, if you want.

SENATOR HALL: If you would, Senator Wesely, if you could elaborate on that a little bit, I would appreciate it because my concern, again, is not for either one of the warring factions here, it is the issue of what happens to the patient in this case?

SENATOR WESELY: I think, Senator Hall, the reason we took the steroids out is that was the one area that the ophthalmologists were particularly concerned about in oral medications, and they made it clear to the committee that that concerned them, and we are all aware of some of the consequences of steroid use, and so the committee was likewise concerned and took that out. But it is one of the options you can use to address those above conditions. Again, they are basically for pain, infection, and inflammation, and other types of oral medications would be allowed now to address those, not steroids, but they would have other options. So, Senator Hall, I think we are still covered. Had the Kristensen amendment been adopted, had they had an inflammation or an infection, nothing could have been done in terms of oral, although it could have had topical, but that may have been where you had the referral question that you've had to in a second visit.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Would you respond to another question?

SENATOR WESELY: Sure.