

June 1, 1993

LB 757

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Chambers, would you respond, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, I will.

SENATOR VRTISKA: I noticed you have been referring to the company doctor as a quack a'l the time and you don't...and you think that the doctor that the employer chooses is anything but a quack. Is that right?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, I refer to the employee's doctor as a real doctor, you've got me.

SENATOR VRTISKA: I guess I'm interested in why is that?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Because I feel that when a per...the hand that feeds is the hand that controls and if a doctor wants to stay on that approved list, he or she is going to have to more or less rule the way the company would desire.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Some of these doctors, and you're speaking all the time of company doctors. Some of these doctors are the doctors of the person's own choice, it's their own family physician that they're dealing with. Isn't that right?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: The ones that I'm talking about are those who don't have a family physician. I should have made that clear.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That's why I kept saying they're the ones funneled to the company doctor.

SENATOR VRTISKA: The problem that I have is that since I have a doctor in the family I...I object to your continually called doctors quacks when you don't really know whether they're quacks or not, do you?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: (Laughter.) Senator Vrtiska, you've got me. No, I don't know they're quacks but if they walk like a duck, if they sound like a duck and so forth, then they are quac^ks.

SENATOR VRTISKA: But I think that's an unfair statement that you continue to put before this body and I don't think that in every instance that that's fair. I think that you continue to