

Submitter: Sharron Fuchs
On Behalf Of: Self
Committee: Senate Committee On Health Care
Measure: SB408

SB 408 - Scope of Practice - Reasons to Oppose or Support

Dear Senator Patterson, Chair; Senator Hayden, Vice-Chair; and Members of the Senate Committee on Health Care

I respectfully submit these two lists and a final question for your consideration:

Reasons to Oppose SB 408:

Doesn't fully explain why this is needed.

Doesn't fully define what scope of practice means.

Doesn't define what 'impact' means.

May throw out existing statutorily granted rights to expand / evolve.

May unnecessarily restrict simple expansion of practices such as use of new tools as technology changes or different uses of existing tools for conditions already treated.

May end up being vicariously a process to litigate potential loss of income rather than other, yet to be defined, intended issues.

May unduly restrict a profession from naturally evolving thus potentially discouraging entry into a profession or retention in a profession.

May unduly restrict technological evolution by developers by forcing a scope of practice review for each profession at every new technological creation. Example: Ultrasound wasn't in existence when the Physiatry, Physical Therapy, Chiropractic, Naturopathic, Massage Therapy professions came into existence or were granted licensure. There are multiple uses of ultrasound - should expanded use of technologies such as this require a scope of practice review?

The person is a whole and can't always be divided into 'territorial' sections by different professions. Example: Use of ultrasound higher in the leg may improve blood flow to the foot. Is the use of ultrasound higher in the leg therefore considered an expansion of the scope of practice?

Multiple professions can and often do offer the same or similar care at lower cost. Failure to allow logical scope of practice expansion without undue burden discourages competition and thus potential cost savings.

Does not currently allow the public to request a scope of practice review.

Does not invoke a scope of practice review in professions with repeated serious harm.

Does not include language of an independent Commission, not the Oregon Health such as the Oregon Health Evidence Review Commission to do the work.

Does not specifically allow the public to speak freely during the actual process of review.

Reasons to Support SB 408:

Could potentially be a neutral body for rational inter-professional discussion.

Could potentially be a forum for more collaborative inter-professional care.

Could potentially add ability of harmed public to request a scope of practice review.

Could potentially add public members to the review panel.

Could potentially be a forum for cost savings.

Does not prohibit litigation for restraint of trade.

Given my lists that show more reasons to Oppose rather than Support the only logical question for your committee to ask is : What is the real reason this bill is being put forth?

Very truly yours,

Sharron Fuchs
Public Citizen
Doctor of Chiropractic Senior Inactive

