

Members present:

Chairman Jeffrey	Assemblyman Sena
Vice Chairman Robinson	Assemblyman FitzPatrick
Assemblyman Bennett	Assemblyman Rusk
Assemblyman Bremner	Assemblyman Tanner
Assemblyman Chaney	Assemblyman Weise
Assemblyman Horn	

The meeting was called to order at 5:15 upon adjournment of Assembly general session.

SB 231: Mr. Kenneth G. Shipley, Assistant Professor at the University of Nevada Reno and member of the Nevada Speech and Hearing Association, stated that they are in favor of this bill because of abuses which have been apparent in the field of speech therapy, brought on partially by the rapid growth in the state. He stated that the Senate committee had amended the bill so that a master's degree would not be mandatory at this time and that though they felt it would be better to require that degree, they felt the amended bill would go a long way to help cure their problems. He discussed with the committee the possibility of re-including that requirement and also the educational opportunities available through the university relative to this subject. Mr. Horn stated that he felt they should draft an amendment to include the masters requirement and then, if the Senate would not agree they could go with the third reprint.

Deanna Emmer stated that she supported the bill because it would be a protective measure for the public. In answer to a question which had been posed earlier by Mr. FitzPatrick she stated that there are currently courses available at the Las Vegas campus which would permit a person who did not have their masters to work for it during the summer. She stated that she was most in favor of the bill because by licensing these people and having a board of professionals, abuses would be reduced or eliminated.

Ben Mackey, stated that he supports the bill because he has a son who works with a speech pathologist. He said that most parents who were involved in this area of therapy were not familiar enough with its technical aspects to know if someone working with their child was really qualified and doing a good job. He pointed out that there are many professions which have a lower level of responsibility who have to be licensed currently.

John Crossley, Legislative Auditor, submitted to the committee an amendment regarding auditing procedures which should be included in the bill. That amendment and cover letter are attached and marked as Exhibit "A".

Ernest Newton stated that he was speaking on behalf of himself as a concerned citizen and that that the bill had been introduced late last session and that it had not had time to get passed.

He said that since the bill was going to have amendments made due to the audit provisions, he felt it would be a good idea to include the amendment to provide for the masters. He pointed out that many of the surrounding state require the masters degree and if it was not required in this state, those people who could not qualify under the other states' laws would come to Nevada to practice. He further stated to the committee that the provisions of this bill would not apply to those people who were working in this area for the various school districts, etc., but only to those working in public practice.

Steven McFarland stated that he was in favor of the bill and that it did not apply, as had been stated before, to those working in the private sector, but that it did to those to whom people were referred (specialists) in the public sector of practice. He agreed with Mr. Newton that the surrounding states had stricter laws and that raising ours in Nevada would discourage people who were not well qualified from coming here to be licensed. He stated that the primary reason for the Senate turning down the masters requirement was that Senator Close felt it was too large a jump from no requirements to that of a masters' degree. He told Mr. Bennett that there are approximately 70 people in the state who would fall under this bill. He answered a question from Dr. Robinson by stating that those who had been in practice in the state before enactment of this bill would be grandfathered in according to the provisions of the bill.

SB 394: Lester Goddard, Commissioner of Savings and Loans, submitted to the committee a recap of the substantive changes which is attached and marked as Exhibit "B". He stated that those changes have been approved of by the members of the savings and loan association. He stated that this bill would allow certain mobile homes, under specific conditions, to be financed over a 30 year loan the same as a regular residence. He said that the second provision of the bill would allow the commissioner to give permission for a savings and loan to split stock to an amount under \$1.00 par value to allow for growth. He stated also that the provision on page 9, line 30 would establish in the law the requirement that the savings and loan associations would have to be audited not less than once every 2 years. He said that they are currently audited in conjunction with the federal audit, every 13-15 months, but they felt there should be some statutory mandate regarding the need for audit. He stated that they also receive monthly reports from the savings and loan offices which are reviewed and which can trigger additional audits.

SB 303: Dr. E. M. Scrivner, Chiropractor from Carson City and member of the State Board of Examiners, stated that this bill had been amended to such an extent that the only thing that it currently proposed to cover was the ability of a person to elect to see a chiropractic physician and have the visit covered under NIC. Dr. Lon Harter of Carson City, also pointed out that this bill was necessary because, in the 1977 Session, chiropractors had been left off of the definition of physician under NRS 630.633. He further stated that they are working now under permission from

the Board, but that this bill would bring the law in line with legislative intent. He said that this would give the patient the legal right to seek chiropractic care directly. The doctors discussed with the committee why the balance of the bill had been amended out and they stated that the NIC provisions which were still included were the only ones which they had originally wished to have changed.

SB 389: No one was present to testify on this bill and Chairman Jeffrey stated that it would be held over to following meetings.

SB 90: It was noted that Secretary of State, Bill Swackhamer, had been present earlier, and that since he was not present, the bill would be held over.

SB 348: Dr. Robert Brown, Nevada State Medical Association, spoke in opposition to this bill and his remarks are attached and marked as Exhibit "C".

It was noted that Senator Jacobsen had been notified of this hearing. Attached as Exhibit "D" are Senate minutes of 3/28/79 on this bill.

Chairman Jeffrey read to the committee a proposed amendment to the bill which had been submitted by the Attorney General's Office which is attached and marked as Exhibit "E".

SB 75: Dick Hamm, Bureau of Alcohol and Drug Abuse, stated that this bill had also been introduced in the 1977 session and that it was the intention of the bill to make alcohol treatment coverage optional with group insurance. He stated that this had come from a legislative study committee and he felt the bill was excellent and that the bureau does support the bill as amended. He also said that there would be a review committee formed to keep track of this and that they would be reporting back to the 1981 session as to its progress. Mr. Hamm stated that according to his information, the Insurance Division is in agreement with the bill.

Joe Braswell, Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada and Co-chairman of the Governor's Advisory Board, told the committee that he was in support of the bill and his remarks are attached and marked as Exhibit "F". The committee discussed with Mr. Braswell and Mr. Hamm the problems which are apparent in the treatment of alcohol abuse, i.e. incorrectly diagnosed illness, loss of work hours, refusal to accept the problem until forced to do so, etc.

A representative of Suma corporation asked the committee what impact passage of this bill would have on the rates and provisions of their group policy. Mr. Hamm replied to him that it would have absolutely no impact, unless Suma elected to have that type of coverage included in their policy. In answer to a question from Chairman Jeffrey, Mr. Hamm stated that the reason benefits are listed in the bill is because those are the minimum benefits which could be offered by an insurance carrier.

Minutes of the Nevada State Legislature

Assembly Committee on.....COMMERCE.....

Date:.....May 3, 1979.....

Page:.....Four.....

SB 410: Chairman Jeffrey stated that this bill would be held over to a following meeting for hearing and that Dr. Robinson would be assigned the task of bringing information on this bill before the committee.

There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Also attached to these minutes are letters which have been received in support of SB 231, for the record and marked as Exhibit "G".

Respectfully submitted,

Linda D. Chandler
Linda D. Chandler
Secretary

1531

STATE OF NEVADA
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU

LEGISLATIVE BUILDING
CAPITOL COMPLEX
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89710



LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION (702) 885-5627

DONALD R. MELLO, *Assemblyman, Chairman*
Arthur J. Palmer, *Director, Secretary*

INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE (702) 885-5640

FLOYD R. LAMB, *Senator, Chairman*
Ronald W. Sparks, *Senate Fiscal Analyst*
William A. Bible, *Assembly Fiscal Analyst*

ARTHUR J. PALMER, *Director*
(702) 885-5627

FRANK W. DAYKIN, *Legislative Counsel* (702) 885-5627
JOHN R. CROSSLEY, *Legislative Auditor* (702) 885-5620
ANDREW P. GROSE, *Research Director* (702) 885-5637

April 20, 1979

Assemblyman John E. Jeffrey
Chairman, Committee on Commerce
Legislative Building
Carson City, Nevada 89710

Dear Assemblyman Jeffrey:

SB 231 is presently before your committee. It might be that the proposed Board of Examiners for Audiology and Speech Pathology should be treated, for purposes of audit in accordance with NRS 218.825, as are all other professional licensing boards.

Accordingly, we would like to suggest that SB 231 be amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"The provisions of NRS 218.825 apply to the Board of Examiners for Audiology and Speech Pathology,"

We are available to discuss this with you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. CROSSLEY, C.P.A.
LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

By Wm. Gary Crews
Wm. Gary Crews, C.P.A.
Audit Manager

JRC:WGC:rie
Enclosure

EXHIBIT "A"

2. Except as otherwise required by this chapter, the legislative auditor shall not disclose the content of any audit before it is presented to the legislative commission.

(Added to NRS by 1977, 756)

218.825 Reports of audits of boards, commissions filed with legislative auditor; style of reports prescribed by legislative auditor; audits by legislative auditor when legislative commission dissatisfied.

1. Each of the boards and commissions created by the provisions of chapters 623 to 625, inclusive, chapters 628 to 644, inclusive, and chapters 654 and 656 of NRS shall engage the services of a certified public accountant or public accountant, or firm of either of such accountants, to audit all of its fiscal records once each year between June 30 and December 1 for the preceding fiscal year. The cost of the audit shall be paid by the board or commission audited.

2. A report of each such audit shall be filed by the accountant with the legislative auditor and the director of the budget on or before December 1 of each year. The legislative auditor shall prescribe the standards to be used in performing the audits and the general style and form to be followed in preparing the reports.

3. The legislative auditor shall audit the fiscal records of any such board or commission whenever directed to do so by the legislative commission. When the legislative commission directs such an audit, it shall also determine who is to pay the cost of the audit.

(Added to NRS by 1963, 143; A 1963, 1009; 1967, 931; 1969, 133; 1973, 1663; 1975, 113, 1470; 1977, 130, 1178)

218.830 Biennial report of legislative auditor.

1. The legislative auditor shall prepare a biennial report for the governor and members of the legislature, which shall be submitted prior to December 31 of each even-numbered year. Copies of the report shall be filed in the office of the secretary of state.

2. The biennial report shall contain, among other things:

(a) Copies of, or the substance of, reports made to the various state departments, as well as a summary of changes made in the system of accounts and records thereof.

(b) Specific recommendations to the legislature for the amendment of existing laws or the enactment of new laws designed to improve the functioning of various departments of the state government.

[11:205:1949; 1943 NCL § 7345.11]—(NRS A 1963, 1020; 1969, 134; 1973, 312, 1664)

218.850 Regular and special audits and investigations.

1. Each of the audits provided for in this chapter shall be made and concluded as directed by the legislative commission and in accordance with the terms of NRS 218.740 to 218.890, inclusive.

2. The legislative commission shall direct the legislative auditor to



Robert List
Governor

State of Nevada
Commissioner of Savings Associations

Capitol Complex
106 East Second Street
Carson City, Nevada 89710
(702) 885-4259

Lester O. Goddard
Commissioner

April 24, 1979

TO: Presidents, all savings and loan associations in Nevada
FROM: Lester O. Goddard, Commissioner *LG*
SUBJ: SB394 (Chapter 673)

Enclosed is a copy of the amended SB394, which incorporates the changes I suggested at the original hearing of the Senate Commerce and Labor Committee.

The changes which are important (disregarding the technical wording changes by the Legislative Counsel Bureau) are:

- | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| page 1, lines 3-8 | page 7, line 1 |
| page 1, lines 12-15 | page 7, line 18 |
| page 3, lines 22-23 | page 8, lines 9-13 |
| page 3, lines 43-45 | page 9, lines 30-32 |
| page 4, lines 24-25 | page 9, lines 44 |
| page 4, lines 35-36 | page 9, lines 47-49 |
| page 5, line 36 | |
| page 6, line 3-14 | |

I believe this is approved by the Senate Committee with a Do-Pass recommendation, but has not as yet come before the Assembly Committee.

EXHIBIT "B"

a division of the Department of Commerce
James L. Wadhams, Director

NEVADA
STATE
MEDICAL
ASSOCIATION

NEIL SWISSMAN, M.D., President
RICHARD G. INSKIP, M.D., President-elect
GORDON L. NITZ, M.D., Secretary-Treasurer
ROBERT L. BROWN, M.D., Immed. Past President
LESLIE A. MOREN, M.D., AMA Delegate
LEONARD H. RAIZIN, M.D., AMA Alternate Delegate
RICHARD G. PUGH, CAE, Executive Director

3660 Baker Lane • Reno, Nevada 89509 • (702) 825-6788

May 3, 1979

TO: Assembly Commerce Committee

FROM: Robert L. Brown, M.D.

SUBJ: S. B. 348

Chairman Jeffrey and members of the Assembly Commerce Committee:

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you to speak against S.B. 348. It is essential to continue to stress physician competence and skill if patient care is to continue to improve. Since strong and well-motivated desires to see things improve quickly can pressure state legislators to mandate educational activities that are ahead of the state of the art, it is essential to test methodologies and approaches before legislation is enacted.

Long before mandatory continuing medical education requirements were imposed by medical organizations or licensing boards, physicians were voluntarily participating in continuing medical education programs with the intent of improving their knowledge and skills.

Mandatory continuing medical education, however, has many drawbacks:

1. It requires an additional bureaucratic function to police these requirements and ascertain that each one submitted is authorized. This is counterproductive to our current feelings about trimming agency expenditures.
2. As of July, 1978, \$1.9 billion (or approximately 1% of the total health care dollar expenditure) is spent annually for continuing medical education. Mandatory requirements would only increase these expenditures. Obviously, these increased costs would be passed on to the patient.
3. Mandatory continuing medical education does not guarantee what the public expects and is in no way a measure of physician competence.
4. In excess of 90% of Nevada physicians now participate in voluntary CME programs. Therefore, there is no need for this mandatory regulation in Nevada. I have submitted to you a copy of a recent survey which substantiates these figures.

I urge this committee to reject the concepts of S.B. 348 and to defeat the bill.

RLB:d

EXHIBIT "C"

1535

MANDATORY CONTINUING MEDICAL EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Continuing medical education should be mandatory for physicians.

<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
136	248	384

2. I voluntarily participated in CME programs this last year.

<u>YES</u>	<u>NO RESPONSE</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>NO RESPONSE</u>	<u>TOTAL (YES)</u>
114	22	203	15	30	317
(avg. credits)		(avg. credits)			
30-60 yr.		30-60 yr.			

3. I am a member of my specialty society.

<u>YES</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
114	204	318

4. My specialty society has mandatory CME requirements.

<u>YES</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
53	50	103
(Avg. credits)	(Avg. credits)	
30 yr.	30 yr.	

SUMMARY:

384 doctors responded to the questionnaire. Two to one are opposed to the concept of mandatory continuing medical education. Ten to one voluntarily participated in CME programs last year.

318 of the responding doctors are members of their specialty societies, 103 of which require an average of 30 CME credits per year.

Library Note:

During the examination of this set of minutes, Exhibits D, E, F, and G were found to be missing. They also appear to have been missing at the time this set of minutes was hand numbered, as the numbering does not have a gap where these exhibits should be. The exhibits are also missing from the microfiche.

Research Library
July 2010