

insinuate that every company that has hires...that employs a doctor that they're a bunch of quacks, and I guess I object to that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Vrtiska, I think the bill is unfair to require a person to go to a doctor other than of his or her own choosing and I call them quacks because I don't think the relationship of trust exists in this set of circumstances. But I think you make a very valid point, not all of them are quacks, but would you agree that some of them might be?

SENATOR VRTISKA: Well, I think some of them might be that the injured worker might go to to find that...to get their point of view that they want to hear could also be quacks.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SENATOR VRTISKA: And so...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I can see that, but do you think some of these company doctors may be quacks?

SENATOR VRTISKA: Oh, I wouldn't go so far as to say that because I don't know any of them, but...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you think any of them could be?

SENATOR VRTISKA: Possible, but I'm...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, those are the ones I'm talking about.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Well, how about...how about on the other side? Do you agree that some of them that...that the injured person goes to see, shops around and finds a doctor that maybe would share his view and then try to help him get some money that maybe he's not entitled to also? I mean, there's...it's looks to me like we've got two sides to this issue and we're just...we're just spending our time not really resolving the issue but talking about the medical profession in rather...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Disparaging terms.

SENATOR VRTISKA: ...disparaging terms that I don't necessarily totally agree with because that really isn't the issue, to begin with. I think the issue is how we can best serve the people who