

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied  
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)



Opposition came from insurance companies, who felt the measure was anti-consumer and anti-competitive. They particularly objected to the use of "prevailing rates," and efforts to meet this concern were a major focus of the Committee.

631 AN ACT TO PROHIBIT HOSPITAL SERVICES PRICE DISCRIMINATION Sen. Dow LV/WD  
HSE ACCT LV/WD  
SEN ACCT LV/WD

SUMMARY: The bill's intent was to provide equity among non-governmental payors of health care costs. It prohibited hospitals from making contracts with 3rd party payors which were anti-competitive, or which discriminated in price because of different payment methods or services of a 3rd party payor.

The bill was considered together with the other bills on hospital costs, LDs 1174 and 1353; the Committee and some of the other interested parties felt the resulting compromise bill, LD 1737, addressed the equity among payors issue satisfactorily, at least for the present.

632 AN ACT TO PERMIT THE USE OF THE DRUG DIMETHYL SULFOXIDE FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION Sen. Dutremble LV/WD  
HSE ACCT LV/WD  
SEN ACCT LV/WD

SUMMARY: This bill was identical to LD 1147, submitted in 1981. It allowed physicians to administer DMSO to their patients, or to prescribe it for them. It also allowed pharmacists to sell DMSO to customers who had a written order or prescription from their physician.

The sponsor requested Leave to Withdraw at the public hearing.

633 AN ACT RELATING TO ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES FOR THE EARLY AND PERIODIC SCREENING, DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT PROGRAMS Sen. Gill LV/WD  
HSE ACCT LV/WD  
SEN ACCT LV/WD

SUMMARY: The bill would have required the Department of Human Services to return to a previous accounting system for payments to agencies providing EPSDT programs. Agencies felt the newer system was more time-consuming and expensive for them.

The Department of Human Services felt that the problem was not shared by all agencies, and they worked out a compromise of a new rule permitting agencies which wished an exemption from the new accounting principles to submit a request for one. The agencies and sponsors then agreed to withdraw the bill.