Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB58	PA 588	FAX	1959
Public Health	103-112		10p.
Senate	3799-3800		2p.
House	5614-5615		2p.
		TOTAL	14p.

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2012

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

PUBLIC
HEALTH
AND
SAFETY

CONN.
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
1959

A/K

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

Thursday March 5, 1959

Senator Norman Hewitt, presiding

Members absent: Senators: Raiteri, Dickson, Schaffer, Finney
Representatives: Hill, Taft, Corrigan, Blake, Allyn

Chr. Hewitt: This hearing is now open. We have 3 bills on poliomyelitis and we will consider together. However, if you address your marks to these bills, please specify as to which ones you are referring to. Now, any legislators who would like to speak may get up and speak at the present time on any of the bills to be heard today.

Rep. Mackie: I am very much opposed to H.B. 3830 and S.B. 1170, because I feel that the present statutes sufficiently protect the consuming public and I feel that these bills would impose hardship and unnecessary expense on the manufacturers.

Chr. Hewitt: Any other legislators who would like to speak on any of these bills?

Sen. Alfano, Suffield: I would like to go on record in favor of S.B. No. 57 and 58 which I have introduced. These two bills you can see are all combined in S.B. No. 58. One is strickly an appropriation bill of $50,000. That is also provided for in 58. So, if this committee gives favorable approval, I think that bill no. 58 alone could be reported off favorable and S.B. No. 57 could be disregarded. This bill, S.B. 58 provides for making it mandatory for children entering school to have poli vaccine shots. Now I know the first question is why make it mandatory. There are so many people throughout the U.S. and in our own state of Conn. who would not go out to protect their own lives or protect the lives of other people. I am advised that there are over 2 million people in Connecticut yet who still haven't had poli shots, and this vaccine has been made available. The best place to tackle this problem is to tackle it among the youngsters as they enter school. Now, the arguments that could be used against any mandatory legislation is (1) how about a child's health; suppose it is detrimental to health. If you will notice in this bill, we have provided that if any youngster or the parent of any youngster secures a certificate from a physcian showing that this child cannot take the vaccine because of his health, then that would be made an exception. (2) the only other opposition to mandatory legislation of this type would be a person who has a religious belief against the vaccination. Now, that is also made an exception in this bill. Any person or parent who has a religious belief against having a child vaccinated by bringing such a certificate or letter to the school board would also be exempted from having the vaccine shot. (3) Third argument would be that a person could not afford it. That is why we ask for $50,000 appropriation in the extreme hardship cases where the child or the parents of the child cannot afford the shots. These funds

would be made available to the local health authorities and therefore these shots would be given free of charge to people in these exceptional cases. I think this is a very good bill. I certainly strongly recommend a favorable report by your committee on this bill. There is a Mr. Berard here from Windsor Locks who has been very active in the poli field. In fact, it was at his request, at his efforts that I put this bill in. You will hear from him later on. Thank you.

Rep. Keilty: You have here only public schools. There are many thousands of private schools in this state. This is a state law, and I am curious as to what effect it would have on that private school angle.

Sen. Alfano: I would say, the way the bill reads now, it probably would not take into consideration private schools.

Rep. Frost: I have been asked to oppose S.B. No. 58 and I personally oppose this also for the simple reason that we feel compulsory medicine, whether it is good or bad, a mother has the right to say what sort of germ goes into the body of the child. As it is today, there are many inoculations going into that little body and I feel by adding this one there will be more to come. Now, as it has been said before, that a certificate from a physician can be obtained. That is very well and true, but now that means an added expense to a mother. I don't know any doctor whose office you can go into and receive such a certificate free, because it takes time as to the secretary and the doctor. Now, I speak with experience because I have left a pediatricians office where I have served for 20 years before I went into politics. Another thing, there are many mothers and I believe they know themselves whether or not that childs needs an inoculation and it is up to them to say it and not for a few of us to make it a law in saying that the small child has to have it done. Please give this your consideration.

Rep. Powers: I am referring to H.B. No. 3774 regarding Membership of the Connecticut Medical Examining Board. The Board is made up of 5 members and it gives no regard to the specialty fields. In other words, you could have 4 or 5 or say 3 pediatricians, one surgeon and one in general medicine, and your obstretrician would have no representation. This board would give representation to men who are doctors in the fields of general medicine, surgery, obstretrics and pediatrics. I might add that the council of the State Medical Society favors this bill, The American Academy of Pediatrics, a Connecticut chapter, favors this bill and the State Pediatrics Society which is made up of pediatricians and general physicians are in favor of this bill. I have been asked, however, to make an amendment and I am willing to do it. In the middle of the bill it says "Shall include one qualified representative from each from the fields of general medicine, surgery, obstetrics

and pediatrics, who shall be a member of the medical society which governs the practice of medicine." The amendment would be "Who shall be a recognized specialist in the field." That would strike out a member of the medical society which governs the practice. . . . There will be others speaking on this bill. The reason they wanted that amended, there are some recognized specialists in the field, they feel that they should also be considered on the board.

Rep. Vernovai, from Watertown: I refer to H. R. No. 20 introduced by Rep. Keilty and myself. I would like to state that this is a request and should be so noted.

Chr. Hewitt: Any other members of the general assembly who would like to speak? Hearing no one, we will consider S.B. 57 and 58.

S.B. No. 57 (Sen. Alfano) PROVIDING AN APPROPRIATION FOR THE PURCHASE OF POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE.

S.B. NO. 58 (Sen. Alfano) REQUIRING POLIMYELITIS VACCINATIONS FOR EACH PUBLIC SCHOOL CHILD.

Jean Berard, Windsor Locks: I am in favor of S.B. 57 and 58 because it will wipe out almost entirely poli from Conn. 35% of the children under 5, that is 63,000, are not fully protected in this state. 12% of the children in the 5 to 9 group, or 23,796, are not fully protected. 17% of the 10 to 14 inclusive age group, or 28,858, are not fully protected, that is, they haven't had any or all of the shots, that is completed the 3 series. 34% in the 15 through and including the 17 year old, or 24,742, have not completed or had any of the 3 shots. Why not, you may ask. Many people think that poli is licked. A thing of the past, but it isn't. As we all know it increased last year in Connecticut. Many don't have the money, $5 an inoculation. Well, this inoculation requires 3 inoculations to be fully covered. It is different from any of the other shots we are aware of. That would run $15 per child and now they are even talking about the booster shot. There are a few cases where it is against the religion. I noticed in the Hartford Courant where is an Amish group, which I will leave with you, who are against the inoculations, they were lined up getting their shots because they were stricken quite hard last year with it. Few cases are aware that it is against their health, they get a reaction to penicillen and other chemicals in these vaccines and they get a bad reaction. Many people are apothetic toward it. I will get it later; I don't want it; I don't want to sit in the doctor's office for two or three hours just for a shot; my chances are very slight that I will get it; just don't have the time. In fact, we had a clinic, we inoculated 11 hundred that day, we walked outside and there was a fellow

with his two small children who lived across the street. He said what is going on in there? I said that is where they are giving polio shots. "Oh, I suppose I should get it or let my children get it." Very apothetic. I worked on the teams again for the polio drive this year. There were 3 young girls in the car. We were going to an area to cover and none of them had had any of the shots and many can't afford it through the recession. Many have pride, they don't want to go to a free clinic and get it for 50¢ and some of us are just too lazy to get it. People won't help themselves unless they are forced to. Let's look at it from a financial reason. A wage earner is struck with poli. The town and state will have to take care of his family and his children. They become a burden to the town and the state and now with the shortage of money in our state it is very important that this shouldn't happen now or in the future. Look at Michigan, they are in dire need of money this year, and they were hard stricken with poli last year. Let me refer to an editorial written in the Hartford Courant. "Here in Connecticut despite the best kind of public health work and the splendid cooperation between state and local authorities, there is still a great number of all ages who are unprotected. In round figures, 35% of those under 5 are not fully protected. The best protected age group, 5 to nine has only 12% who has not had all 3 shots. This rises to 17% in the 10 to 14 group, 34% have not had any shots in the 15 to 19 year age group where they are most suseptible. In the 20 and above group there are more than 30% who are not fully protected. In recent years there has been an increasing cases in the upper age brackets. Not until the person reaches age 45 can he or she feel reasonably safe from poli." Now, this bill may not go along with the mandatory part, you might want to change it a little, but I have a copy of the N.J. law back in 1957 which states "The Board of Education in any school district may require all pupils to have received immunization treatment against poli as a prerequisate to attend school, and it may at its discretion require a proof. Any pupil failing to comply with such a requirement may be excluded from school unless the pupil shall present a certificate signed by a physician stating that the pupil is unfit to receive such immunization streatment."

Chr. Hewitt: Do you represent some particular organization?

Gene Barard: Yes, The Old County Manor Home Owners Association in Windsor Locks. In closing, remember in the years to come every type, that is every time you read a youngster being stricken with poli, I hope that this committee will report favorably for S. B. 57 and 58.

Dr. James Hart: Representing the State Department of Health: I have two written statements signed by Dr. Osborn for the two chairmen of the Committee. We also have tried to estimate the needs in Conn. based on surveys we have made, first on the result of our own information obtained by the vaccine already distributed and secondly by surveys carried out through the

schools in Connecticut trying to get an estimate of the number of children who had one shot, 2 or 3. I would like to pass these out to the members of the committee. These tables will show that the actual need in our estimation is much higher than $50,000. The figures we came up with would indicate that some, that is the sum ought to be nearer $170,00 than $50,000. We are in favor of Bill No. 57 which would provide $50,000 for polio vaccine for distribution through local directors of health. I would like to point out what I consider the situation today in regard to the prevention of poli. You will remember back in 1955 when the Salk Vaccine first came out, the legislature throught the approval of the committee on public health and safety and later the appropiation committee did appropriate $100,000 to the State Department of Health for poli vaccine. 2 years ago the same committees on the legislature approporiated a large sum of money, $425,000 for the same purpose. That money, however, was limited in the sense that it had to be spend prior to Oct. 1, 1955. We had only 2 months to spend $400,000 and since the vaccine had only a 6 month dating on it we could not use up all that material so quickly, so a large sum of money had to be returned to the treasury. The money which was apporpriated for poli 2 year ago and was not used was over $100,000. Now, at this point for the last several months we have not had a single vial of vaccine for distribution. So, in our Conn. there have been very few poli clinics. The only ones which have been run have been those in the few cities where the towns themselves appropriated the money for this purpose, and I can say that of the 169 towns probably not more than 5 or 6% are really doing anything actively in a clinic way. There is great need for money for this purpose. If the legislature does not appropriate any money now, it will go back to the individual town, and each town will be asked to provide funds for their own children and for their adults, if they want to run an adult clinic. There is another point. Children who are actually on welfare will be provided for, and this will increase the cost of the protection of these children, because the doctor will have to do it privately and of course an added fee is attached there. What is more important, however, is the fact that if we do not do this there will be very little done. You can advise people to go to there own physician and get it done, but our experience over the years is that unless you also run a public clinic for those who cannot afford to pay, then you will find that the job is not done. We have seen a number of cases of poli drop from 654 in 1955 to 83 in 1956, 38 in 1957 and last year they rose again to 42. Last year we had 3 deaths. There was a small outbreak of poli in Bridgeport. They had 13 cases and 2 people died. As a result of that, bridgeport was very anxious and is anxious today to immunize all their children. They did run poli clinics all during the summer. They even put in a regulation requiring poli immunizarion before entry to school/ I do not know on what state law they based this regulation,

but if there is going to be any such provision locally I think there is some need for a State law to back up these towns. If we do not do this today, I am almost certain, without any question that we are going to have more cases this year, more deaths, and these are all unnecessary. There is very little point in discovering a new vaccine if it isn't goint to be used. I think the national people are interested and worried. At the State level we are pretty much powerless to do anything, unless we have some provision to take care of those people who cannot afford to go to a private doctor and get private care. The State Department of Health is very much in favor of Bill 57 which will provide such money. I do want to point out in this bill 57 as written that there is a restriction in that it, that is the money could only be used for pupils in primary and secondary schools of this stage. We think this is a severe restriction on the use of this money, because the greatest need is for pre-school children. As Mr. Berard testified, the greatest need for immunization are the young children, the pre-school children as well as in older people. All severe cases of poli last year were in adults. All young people in their twenties, all were parents of young children and of the 5 severe cases 3 died. We feel that the vaccine should not be restricted to children in the schools, so we have in our letter submitted by Dr. Osborn, we have suggested, submitted a suggested substitute for Bill 57 which would merely say that the sum of $50,000 be appropriated to the State Department of Health for the purpose of poli vaccine for the distribtuion according to Section 19-27 of the general statutes. That is the present law which provides the department to purchase biologics of all types with the free use for the people of this state upon the purchase thereof with financial hardship and we suggest this as a substitute, because then the money and the vaccine could be used where it is needed the most, that is for pre-schools and other people beside school children who need them.

Rep. Perri: When you speak about schools, would that include Southbury Training School? What about the pupils in Southbury and Mansfield?

Dr. Hart: Yes, if they qualify, in financial hardship cases. This money would be used for people who cannot afford to pay for it. It is for the medically indigent.

Rep. Turner: I have a question on bill 58. The first line, "Each Board of Education shall require" Does the State Department favor compulsory legislation of this sort?

Dr. Hart: We have not been advocating compulsory immunization of any sort. There is only one law on the statutes today that requires compulsion and that is smallpox vaccine which gives each local board of education the authority to require it. And that essentially is an eduction law and not a health department law. Such a law is very useful and very efficient in getting the job done, but our philosophy has always been education and trying to convince

people that these things are good and right and should be done and getting them done that way. I think that we have had a good program up to this point. Without any money or vaccine we are really strapped to do anything further.

Rep. Turner: I just noted in passing while the N.J. bill was being read to us, it is a permissive law, it uses the word may instead of shall.

Dr. Hart: I think it is comparable to our smallpox vaccination law.

Chr. O'Loughlin: Is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor of Bill 57?

Dr. Bergdorf, Director of Health in the City of Hartford. I would first like to speak as a member of the State Medical Society and say that the society is in favor of additional appropriation for the purchase of poli vaccine. They feel that although there is a tremendous amount of immunization being done by the private physician, that there are large numbers of people in the State who have need for this free vaccine. Then I would like to speak also as a Director of Health in Hartford and a s a member of the group known as Full-Time Directors of Health. We feel that there is a great need for this additional expenditure of fund for poli vaccine. We would like to point out that unlike the other funds that the state provides for the purchase of biologics to which Dr. Hart has just referred that we are suddenly confronted with a situation where large numbers of people are suddenly in need of immunization. In regards to the other diseases such as smallpox, dipptheria, whooping couch, etc., children have been handled as they come along so that the number who are requiring immunization in any one year is small, but in regard to poli we suddenly have a large population which haven't been treated as they grew up through the pre-school years and the school years and have not had the opportunity. And for this reason you are requested to appropriate monies which are above and beyond the normal amounts of money that are asked for for the provision of biologics for other diseases. I might say that I agree with Dr. Hart that these monies should not be restricted to primary and secondary school children, because I will quote as an example the activity we carry on here in the city of Hartford. In the City of Hartford we have first and foremost the biggest number of immunizations are done by the private physician. The second large number are done by the Health Department in the pre-school. We have a program going on in connection with the parent-teachers association whereby people who live in certain school areas can be immunized, this is for adults. In addition to that the local city council appropriated funds some time ago and directed the Health Department and the Board of Education to furnish immunization to all the children in all the schools. So, if you use Hartford as

an example of a kind of a city where a total program is being attempted you recognize that there are tremendous numbers of vaccine required. So, we would be in favor of this. The state society is engaged at the present time in a program to urge all of the county medical associations to put on an action program in order to reach the people who have not yet been immunized and all of these programs require free vaccine. It is well known that where you have public clinics, it stimulates the private administration of vaccine, and I believe Dr. Hart pointed this out. He said that programs are apt to last that is to lack inititive unless you have something you can talk about for the people who are medically indegent. That stimulates also the people who are not medically indigent to seek these services privately.

Rep. Turner: What does the State Medical Society think about the word shall as against may in line one of bill 58?

Dr. Bergdorf: The Medical Society has considered this bill initially that it is not in keeping with our American pattern to require compulsory immunization. They point out the fact that without this type of thing we have conquered diphtheria; we feel that a more realistic approach is to make available facilities rather than trying to compel people, because we want to avoid as much regulation in our personal lives as we can.

Dr. Pierce, State Welfare Department: We are supporting and looking after in great many respects a population of some 40,000, heavily weighted with school schildren and pre-school children. We have in the past seen to it that as many of these children as we control, that is particularly the state wards that are committed to the Commissioner of Welfare, that they undergo the customary immunization. Our workers are also encouraged to aquaint the rest of the population with the need for continuing immunizations of all kinds, particularly at this moment with poli immunization. As so well understood, these schedules, the fee schedules of the doctors issured by the commissioner of Finance and Control in March 1, 1957 specifies that the state would not pay for vaccine such as these since they could be obtained from the local directors of health who are to be supplied by the State department of health. That was the accepted system. It costs us about 48, 59¢ for the vaccine and no charge for the professional services. If we can't get the vaccine sent out to these people who need them it would cost us something like this. We have to pay the prescription weight for the poli vaccine which $2.83 as against 50¢ from the Health Department, plus the cost of immunization as shown in these schedules of Commissioner of Finance and Control which amounts to $4.60, a total of $7.35 as against 50¢ if wh do it through the Health Department. The difference would be $6.83 per individual.

Rep Turner: In your estimation of $6.83 can the Health Department obtain these shots for $0.50?

Dr. Pierce: It costs 44¢ a shot. That would be $1.32 for 3 shots.

Rep. Shanley: I am in favor of having $50,000 appropriated to the State Department of health for the purchase of poli vaccine. I feel that the vaccine should not be restricted to public school children. It should include all children in public and private schools of our State. I feel there are flaws in both bills 57 and 58, although I support them both in their basic ideas. I would also like to speak on my own bill H.B. No. 3204 THE COST OF POLIOMYELITIS VACCINATIONS FROM PRIVATE PHYSICIANS. By Bill 57 and 58 you are protecting the children of our state who cannot afford to pay for the cost of the vaccine shot. In my bill I feel we will protect the public at large. There have been a good many doctors that have been very public spirited, who have not overcharged. They have charged maybe $1 which takes care of the cost of giving the shot. There have been others who have charged $5 and more for one shot. I feel that there should be some restriction by doctors who are giving free poli vaccine, whether it be from the poli foundation or whether it be from the State. I think some doctors have made a racket out of poli vaccinations and I would like to see a maximum fee of $3 for the vaccine shots.

Lawrence Soda: I approve of Bill No. 57 but for Bill 58 I have 2 or 3 objections I would like to bring out. Dr. Hart and the other doctor from Hartford, they have practically taken the words right out of my mouth, but the point I was objecting to mainly was the compulsory business in this bill here, that the child had to present a certificate from a doctor approved by the Director of Health of that town. I think that that is bad. I think it should be that any physician of any of the healing arts licensed in this state, but this business of bringing it down to approved director I don't see. I am against the compulsory end of it. Anyother thing here is that you have contrary to religious beliefs. It has been brought out here that this bill makes absolutely no provision for anyone who may have an objection of his own. There have been a lot of material on the poli vaccine pro and con. I am speaking for myself; I represent no one. You pick up the paper and see before when it first came out there was going to be no paralytic poli. Salk vaccine is gladly going to wipe it out. You pick up the paper the next day and you see it has gone up 40%. I am not arguing with that, but there are very good objections people have to these shots and that is their own business, whether it be religious medical or anything else and I think that this should be preserved. Another thing, on the ability to pay. According to this bill the child or the parent would practically have to take the paupers' oath to be eligible for the vacdine which I disagree 100%. I don't think the ability to pay should enter into the matter. If the State is willing and going to appropriate the money for the vaccine, they should have no charge pointed out in school because his mother couldn't pay. I am all in favor of the

appropriation these gentlemen have asked for. Another thing, well it would just be repeating. Thank you.

P. Francis Hicks of Winsted: With your permission I would like to remark on S.B. 57 and 58 and H.B. 3204. S.B. 57 we favor, although we do feel that it should be extended to private schools as well, and that it should be extended even further for the use of adults, because it has been our experience in Litchfield County this past year that the age bracket is moving up and the parents of these children are being stricken now and they are going to be in the position where they won't be the bread winners and it is going to increase a greater problem on the towns and the state. As far as the distribution being left to the directors of health I do wonder if there couldn't be another remedy for that because in some particular cases it hasn't always been handled in the best methods by the health officers. Now, in order to bring about the best good under S.B. 57, if it is adopted, it is only natural that H.B. 3204 should be enacted into a law as well as S.B. 57, because in Litchfield County we do know that with under the last grants by the State and by the National Foundation as well where the vaccine was made available free that some doctors did take advantage of the fees and charged from 5 to 7 dollars, which is unreasonable. In connection with S.B. 57 we favor that as well and there again we hope that this can be changed so that it would incorporate all elementary school children. We are for all three bill, 57, 58 and 3204 with the changes.

Rep. Adams, Waterbury: I am in favor of S.B. 57 with a couple of exceptions here. I would like to simplify it. I don't think this bill specifies public school children. It just says the same two children which includes private as well as public schools. I would like to have the Bill read this way. It would shorten it up and would cover everything: "The sum of $50,000 is appropriated to the State Department of Health for the purchase of poli vaccine for distribution to towns, city and borough directors of health, who shall furnish the same two children and adults of this state at no cost. Statement of Purpose: To provide an appropriation for the purpose and distribution of poli vaccine for the benefit of people of this state at no cost." I will leave you a copy. I want to register against S.B. 58 because of its compulsory attitude. I want to register for Bill 3204. Thank you.

Bentley: I want to speak in favor of H.B. 3204.

Chr. O'loughlin: Anyone else in favor of these bills? We will now hear the opposition to S.B. 57 and 58, or H.B. 3204? Hearing none the hearings on these 3 bills- - - - -

Dr. Bergdorf: I will speak on 3204 which provides that a specific fee be injected into the State Statutes. I believe that it is an undesireable social development to introduce a specific fee, for this would be establishing a precedent that I think would lead to very undesirable future developments. I think that the occasional thing that people hear are in the great minority and I think that a great majority of physicians do an outstanding job in promoting and carrying out poli vaccine. I think it would be very undesirable to introduce this type of a fee.

S-36

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1959

VOL. 8
PART 8
3625-4196

MONDAY JUNE 1, 1959.

THE CLERK:

Cal. No. 1778. File No. 1507. Senate Bill No. 58. An Act requiring Poliomyelitis Vaccinations for Each Public School Child. Favorable report of the Committee on Public Health and Safety.

SENATOR HEWITT:

Mr. President..

THE CHAIR:

Senator from the 25th.

SENATOR HEWITT:

I move for acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Remarks?

SENATOR HEWITT:

Mr. President, this bill would place it within the discretion of the local boards of education to require that poliomyelitis vaccinations be given to each child prior to his admission to school. It has sufficient safeguards to protect religious beliefs as well as any physical affects that such vaccinations might have upon a child. I'd like to point out, Mr. President, that in the State of Connecticut thirty-five per cent of the children under five years of age or 63,000 of them were not fully protected in this state. Twelve per cent of the children in the five to nine group or over 24,000 children are not fully protected. Mr. President, polio has not been wiped out yet. I believe this bill will go a long way towards doing it. I urge its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Are there further remarks? If there are no further remarks, the question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Those in favor signify by saying "aye". Opposed. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Favorable report. Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations. Senate Bill No. 1300. An Act making Appropriations for Each of the Fiscal Years in the Period Ending June 30, 1961.

SENATOR FERLAND:

Mr. President, I move for suspension of rules for immediate consideration of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on suspension of the rules for immediate consideration of this bill. Any objection? Seeing none the rules are suspended.

SENATOR FERLAND:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Remarks?

SENATOR FERLAND:

Mr. President, members of the Circle, this bill calls for an appropriation in the general fund for operating expenses of $1,291,790, under fixed charges payment to local governments, $94,270. Other than payments to local governments, $228,500. The

H-51

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1959

VOL. 8
PART 13
5565-6111

LFS. 50

of the Bill in Concurrence with the Senate. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Bill is passed.

The CLERK:

Calendar No. 2001. File No. 1507. Senate Bill No. 58. An Act requiring Poliomyelitis Vaccinations for Each Public School Child. Committee on Public Health and Safety.

THE SPEAKER:

The lady from Fairfield.

MISS KATONA OF FAIRFIELD:

Mr. Speaker, I move Acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill in Concurrence with the Senate.

THE SPEAKER:

The question is on the Acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill in Concurrence with the Senate. Will you remark.

MISS KATONA OF FAIRFIELD:

Mr. Speaker, this is a permissive piece of legislation aiding local Boards of Education in carrying out a polio vaccination program. This Bill is modeled after New Jersey's Act which has prove eminently satisfactory. The Committee urges this Report as a necessary act of public safety. Thank you.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. If not the question is on

LFS 51

The Acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill in Concurrence with the Senate. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 2004. File No. 1471. Senate Bill No. 317. An Act concerning Education of Handicapped Children. Committee on Appropriations.

THE SPEAKER:

The gentleman from Colchester.

MR. COHEN OF COLCHESTER:

May this be passed, retaining.

tHE SPEAKER:

Passed, retaining.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 2005. File No. 1457. Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1092. An Act authorizing Helen Crane to Sue the County of Hartofrd. Committee on Claims.

THE SPEAKER:

Passed, retaining.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 2009, Page 22. File No. 1476. Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1248. An Act concerning the Retirement of Francis Sheehy of Waterbury. Committee on Cities and Boroughs.