

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-20		6056	5	8	2
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Public Health & Safety</i> 34 • <i>Public Health & Safety</i> 57 • <i>Public Health & Safety</i> 61-62 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 572-575 • 607-610 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 595-596

H-109

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 2
449-973**

Thursday, March 4, 1971

19

construction cost.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks. If not all those in favor indicate by saying "Aye". Those opposed. The Bill is passed.

MR. COHEN (BOZRAH):

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Cohen.

MR. COHEN (BOZRAH):

Move suspension of the rules for immediate transmittal to the Senate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection to suspension and/or transmittal. Hearing no objection, the rules are suspended and the Bill is transmitted to the Senate.

CLERK:

Calendar 50, House Bill 6056, An Act Concerning the Piercing of Ears, File 24.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Yacavone of the 17th.

MRS. YACAVONE (East Hartford):

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Questions on acceptance and passage. Will you remark.

MRS. YACAVONE (East Hartford):

ad

Thursday, March 4, 1971

20

ad

I think that this Bill is a logical step to improve the law passed in 1969. It's a simple deletion of the words "for remuneration", so that if a person is interested in perhaps in selling earrings offer to pierce ears, they may be endangering the public health and I think this is a step for the protection of the public health. I urge passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks. Representative Nevas from the 144th.

MR. NEVAS (WESTPORT):

Mr. Speaker, I wish to support this Bill. I introduced the legislation and it results from abuses that have crept into this procedure since passage of this Bill on the part of some jewelers who make tie-in sales that were, in that they suggest to the customer that if they buy a pair of earrings they will pierce their ears and make no charge. I think it's common knowledge that the overwhelming majority of people who are such customers and are teen-age girls who are unsophisticated and are unaware of the dangers in which they are exposing themselves when they permit jewelers to do this kind of work. In my own district recently, a young 15 year old girl who was diabetic permitted a jeweler to pierce her ears and became seriously ill and as a result of an infection. In many instances staff infections have been reported as a result of unclean instruments used by the jewelers and therefore I think that the deletion of the words "for remuneration" which would limit the practice solely to licensed physicians is a good addition to

Thursday, March 4, 1971

21

the Bill. Thank you.

MR. MAHANEY (WATERBURY):

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Mahaney.

MR. MAHANEY (WATERBURY):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a comment relative to the comments that have been made on this Bill. I agree with the last speaker that it has merit when you approach a commercial venture, but I'd like to put on the record here in admonition that this Bill also, if passed, will make it fine for a mother to pierce her daughter's ears. Now I think that there have been many groups of people, some ethnic groups that historically in the past, have made this a common practice and I just wish to point this out, that this is a broad encompassing prohibition against any person piercing any other person's ear and making it a crime if they do it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Representative Spain of the 166th.

MR. SPAIN (DANBURY):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention the same problems which Representative Mahaney has brought out in connection with this. I think if this Bill is drafted to keep jewelers from making tie-in sales, it should be drafted that way, if that's its purpose. This I think is too all encompassing to accomplish a very narrow purpose.

ad

Thursday, March 4, 1971

22

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the Bill. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying "Aye". Those opposed. The Bill is passed.

CLERK:

Calendar 51, House Bill 5292, An Act Concerning Licensure of Dental Hygienists, File 22.

MR. COHEN (BLOOMFIELD):

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Dr. Cohen from the 41st.

MR. COHEN (BLOOMFIELD):

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of this Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage, will you remark.

MR. COHEN (BLOOMFIELD):

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is three-fold. First, it has been a statute on the books for the 50 years which I have been practicing dentistry, which was never noticed before until I came into the Legislature. This Bill as it is worded, only permits women to become hygienists, and I think this is strictly unconstitutional and this should be stricken and made available to men also. The second purpose is to equalize what the Lib movement has been doing to us men. At the present time women can be doctors, dentists, lawyers, legislators, truck drivers, bar tenders, etc. This will at

ad

Tuesday, March 9, 1971 10.

the unwary, and unfair. I move adoption of the Amendment.

EFH

MR. SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the adoption of the Amendment.

JOHN A. CARROZZELLA:

Mr. Speaker, I did not know of the Amendment. I think maybe we should pass and retain this item until I talk to him, because we did discuss this in Committee. The thought occurred to us, but we decided not to do it, and I'd like to discuss the matter with Mr. Sarasin.

MR. SPEAKER:

Can I ask the gentleman that this matter be passed temporarily to see if preliminary discussion will accomplish anything. We then will return to it. Will the gentleman from the 95th please.

GEORGE W. HANNON, JR.:

Mr. Speaker, may this item be passed temporarily and returned to the Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Without objection, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 50. H.B. No. 6056. An Act concerning the piercing of ears. File 24.

MR. SPEAKER:

For the benefit of the Members who were not here yesterday, this item was reconsidered for the purpose of offering an Amendment today. There was no objection to reconsideration. It was moved by a Member who was on the prevailing side at the time

Tuesday, March 9, 1971 11.

of last Thursday's vote. Reconsideration passed unanimously. The Bill is now properly before you for whatever action you deem proper to take today, so the Chair would now recognize Rep. Nevas, from the 14th. EFH

ALAN H. NEVAS:

Mr. Speaker, I have an Amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill. I understand the Clerk has an Amendment. Will the Clerk please read the Amendment.

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A". In section 1, line 6, before the word "for" delete bracket and after word "remuneration" delete bracket. Line 8, after the word "another," insert: or any person conducting a retail business, who pierces the ears of another at said place of business, or who advertises or offers to pierce the ears of another at said place of business.

ALAN H. NEVAS:

Mr. Speaker, what this Amendment proposes to do is to meet the objections of those Members who were concerned that the Bill, as originally drafted, would prohibit the piercing of ears by members of...by the parents or mothers of children, or members of other groups, and so what this Amendment proposes to do is to reinsert the words "for remuneration", which were in the Bill originally, so that that is now a general prohibition, and that no one can pierce ears for remuneration unless they are a physician,

Tuesday, March 9, 1971 12.

EFH

which is what the Bill now reads, and to add a general prohibition against the piercing of ears at a place of retail business, with or without remuneration.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question is on adoption of the Amendment. Will you remark further.

MORRIS N. COHEN:

Mr. Speaker, this is a good Amendment, and as Chairman of the Public Health and Safety Committee, I approve of it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the Amendment.

GEORGE W. HANNON, JR.:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill was reconsidered yesterday for the insertion of this very Amendment. It makes it a much better Bill, and I support its passage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further remarks on the Amendment. If not, all those in favor of its adoption indicate by saying "aye". Those opposed. The Amendment is adopted. The Chair will rule it technical. We now may proceed with adoption of the Bill as amended.

ALAN H. NEVAS:

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the Bill as amended.

MR. SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance and passage of the Bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark further. If not, all those in favor of the Bill as amended indicate

Tuesday, March 9, 1971 13.

by saying "aye". Those opposed. The Bill is passed.

EFH

THE CLERK:

Calendar 55. H.B. No. 7562. An Act concerning the substitution of a lien in lieu of bond on the dissolution of any attachment. File 43.

CARL R. AJELLO, JR.:

Mr. Speaker, may this item be passed, retaining its place on the Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there objection?

GEORGE C. GUIDERA:

That was my intent also, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER:

Hearing no objection, so ordered

THE CLERK:

Calendar 57, substitute for H.B. No. 5887. An Act placing the service and sale and use of the female wig under the control of the State Department of Health. File No. 30.

MR. SPEAKER:

This item will be passed temporarily, and we will return to it after the last Calendar item.

THE CLERK:

On Page 3, Calendar 58. H.B. No. 5097. An Act concerning service upon non-resident attaching creditor. File 21.

MR. SPEAKER:

Rep. Nevas from the 144th. Question is on Calendar No.

S-77

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1971

VOL. 14

PART 2

474-956

March 23, 1971

Page 26

statutes and by that is, the Probate Courts would continue to be required to maintain the original records. Banks and other agencies which are acting at the present time in a trustee capacity, would be able to destroy some of the original records providing they're using and reproducing them on photocopying machines.

I believe this would be a good housekeeping bill and I would urge its passage.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the bill. Would you remark further? If not, all those in favor of passage of the bill, signify by saying, "aye". Opposed "nay". The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 71. FILE NO. 24. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Safety and Public Health. House Bill No. 6056. An Act Concerning The Piercing of Ears. (As Amended by House Amendment Schedule A)

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill, as amended by House Amendment Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President the 1969 Session of the Legislature passed a bill prohibiting the piercing of ears by anyone other than a qualified physician. This prohibition was aimed at the practice of performing this minor surgery in retail stores. There had been many instances of young girls who had suffered serious infection from this practice. The one flaw in the law and

March 23, 1971

Page 27

in the bill was of course, the words for remuneration. Thereupon, the retail stores hit upon this and waived any charge or any fees for this service. They tied in with the sales of these earrings. And so, this is what we are attempting to do, is drop the words for remuneration and restrict the piercing of ears strictly to a qualified physician and we also prohibit this from being performed on any premises. Since the 1969 Legislature another girl a diabetic suffered some adverse effects in Westport and nearly died. So I think this is a very good bill and deserves passage.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the bill. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of passage of the bill signify by saying, "aye" Opposed "nay". The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 72. FILE NO. 82. Favorable report of the committee on Public Personnel and Military Affairs. Senate Bill No. 109. An Act Concerning the Duties of the Veterans' Home and Hospital Commission.

SENATOR BURKE:

Mr. President, This is a correctional change in the terminology. It is a good bill and should pass.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you for that illuminating explanation of the purposes and background of this bill, Senator Burke. The question is on passage of the bill. Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor of passage of the bill signify by saying "aye". Opposed, "nay". The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC
HEALTH
AND
SAFETY**

**PART 1
1-491**

**1971
Index**

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 18, 1971

industry itself. I have here, which I would leave with the committee if they so desire, one booklet, "Code of Recommended Practices of the Handling of Frozen Foods". This is by the Frozen Food Coordinate Committee in ///. It shows very much the expense to which the industry itself goes to protect its measures, industries and foods. It's unfortunate that somewhere along the line this brings down the /// of the consumer and the quality of frozen foods that you buy in the market today is very ///, not that which you are paying for. This is recognized by the industry itself. I have had favorable comment with the provision that the industry would like to be included in that meditations that formulate the regulations with which they have very good///. One of our leading ///, if can get through the thing, I believe, would like to make comment on it. If not, I will be happy to relay that to the committee on a later date. The company of a very large /// in Connecticut is in favor of a bill of this nature and hopes the industry will /// in consideration in the formulation of the rules. I received a telephone call last night from Mr. Norman Roxene of the Grant Central Market in Stamford, a small independent chain who is well known for quality. They do their own freezing of some merchandise. He has asked that we consider them favorable, both as a retailer and processor /// standard bill, that they also be taken into consideration. He raised the question of whether a federal /// would be more advisable /// place a burden on others. Frankly I would like to ///. Thank you very much.

Se. Pac: Thank you, Representative. Any other legislators?

Rep. Nevas: My name is Alan Nevas. I'm State Representative from the 144th District in Westport. I'm here to speak on Bill #6056 which is AN ACT CONCERNING THE PIERCING OF EARS. This bill was adopted, I believe, at the last session but it has one exception. The bill now provides that no one can pierce anyone's ears for remuneration who is not a licensed physician. The key of course is the word for remuneration. I have offered an amendment to this bill to delete the words for remuneration so that no one can pierce ears in Connecticut unless they are a licensed physician. What has happened since the adoption of the bill is that some jewelers have continued to pierce ears and purportedly do not make a charge for this service and therefore they are excepted from the purview of this bill technically. However, as a practical matter, I am advised by both health officials and police departments that as a practical matter what happens is that there is a tacit understanding, either expressed or by implication, that if they pierce the ears of the individual, the individual woman will buy

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 18, 1971

earrings. And therefore they are using this method to avoid the enforcement of this act. Now the real problem here is that the vast majority of females whose ears are being pierced by non-physicians are teenage girls, young girls, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen years of age, oftentimes without their parent's knowledge or consent. And these youngsters go into these stories. They're not sophisticated. They're not knowledgeable, and when the arrangement is made that the man will pierce their ears if they buy a pair of earrings they accept this proposal and in many instances a serious infection has resulted.

In my own community not too long ago a fifteen year old girl who was a serious diabetic went in and had her ears pierced by a man who was nothing more than a jeweler, and a serious infection resulted because of the fact that this girl was a diabetic. And it was only by prompt medical attention that a very serious consequence did result.. In other instances staph infections have resulted because of unclean conditions under which this service is performed..And therefore I think that this committee and the legislature could perform a real public service for the people of Connecticut and particularly the younger girls by adopting this amendment and restricting the piercing of ears to licensed physicians only. Thank you.

Sen. Pac: Thank you very much, Representative. Any other legislators? In this case the public will be invited to come and speak. Anyone speaking for the bill, for the barber's bill, please come forward. Anyone speaking for it once? Twice? Anyone speaking against it come forward..

Patsy Selsny: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, my name is Patsy Selsny, State Bar of Examiners, also secretary and treasurer of the Connecticut State Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists and Employers, International Union of America. I stand before this committee in the opposition of Bill #5885, concerning this service in a hairdressing parlor, the purpose to allow men to go into beauty shops. We are deadly against to have a man go into beauty shops because right now in the State of Connecticut, especially with the long hair that we have, our barber business is just about fifty percent. If we're going to give this to the hairdresser, they're going to go into the beauty shops /// all the barber shops in Connecticut..Our barbers today only got a haircut left. We don't have no shampoo, we don't have no shaves anymore, we don't have any more massage because our men they don't beautify themselves like the ladies. Thank God the ladies beautify themselves when they go in the beauty shops. They do beautify themselves. And that's why I stand before this committee in opposition to this

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 18, 1971

and with the many actions that have heretofore been taken to limit the effectiveness of the cigarette industry in promoting their product, we feel the time is right, if not overdue, to prohibit the distribution of free samples in the State of Connecticut. We recommend, therefore, that the Public Health and Safety Committee give this bill a favorable report and refer it as quickly as possible to the House and Senate for approval. We further urge your Committee to take whatever steps may be necessary to insure that H.B. 5198 becomes effectively immediately upon receiving the Governor's signature, upon which time the cigarette industry may wish to pay for the legal fees for testing this in the courts. Thank you very much.

Sen. Pac: Anyone else wishing to speak on a subject?

William C. Spring, Jr., M.D. Director of the Aspetuck Valley Health District, 180 Bayberry Lane, Westport: My predecessor has been concerned for several years with ear piercing by laymen. In Westport recently we learned of a twelve year old girl whose ears were pierced by a non-physician. Infection ensued, although she's recovered. Ear piercing is a surgical procedure and should be maintained as a surgical procedure.

Simple though this procedure usually is, the public needs the protection that bill #6056 would afford. We urge you to report favorably on this bill. Thank you.

Sen. Pac: Anyone else wishing to be heard on smoking or piercing of ears? If not you can continue on any subject.

No Name: Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I wish to speak in favor of bill 5323. This is a bill that would permit the Director of Purchases for the state health department to sell to Heifer Project, a non-profit organization, caring for the well being of underprivileged people, would permit the sale of a 1951 truck, which is equipped as an xray van, and other material that may be considered obsolete by the state health board and under the standards of the American Hospital Association.

It is our purpose to send this truck to Guatemala where they are building a mission hospital in the northern portion of Guatemala where there is a great deal of consumption and other diseases where this xray equipment could be put to good use. Also I have been through this territory and I know the problems of transportation and many of these natives cannot get out of their small villages to seek medical care, and it will be our purpose to establish health clinics or health centers where this truck will go and attend people who have assembled at these points. Now this is a 1951 truck

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 18, 1971

they had about ten students. The point is that there is no opportunity for these people to work under current conditions, and we're trying to remedy that. Now there is one young lady here who would like to speak on behalf of the association on this bill, and if I might have her speak at this point then we'd know if there was any opposition to either one of these bills.

Sen. Pac: Yes, as I said earlier, you'll be permitted to file any statements for the next couple of weeks and I'll arrange to have a spokesman of your choosing to speak at a future hearing. I hope that'll be satisfactory to our committee.

Atty. Shaughnessy: Thank you very much, sir, and might I before sitting down present you with some petitions we have in support of these bills? We have about 12,000 signatures which are divided equally between the mens bill and support for the other two bills, if I might file these at this time.

Edna Clark, 90 Mountain Road, Manchester, Conn: By way of qualification I own and operate Theresa Beauty Salon in Manchester and in Bolton. However right now I've completely had the wind taken out of my sails because I find that the written speech I have prepared is almost word for word what Mr. Shaughnessy has just given you. I have spent most of last night preparing this and it would actually be quite ridiculous for me to repeat this. As a matter of fact I almost feel like a schoolchild who has been caught cribbing in class. You know I have the same thing written on my cuff. I'm sure it's all purely coincidental, and more than likely great minds in the same channels. Just ditto me for everything Mr. Shaughnessy has said. Thank you very much.

Sen. Pac: Thank you very much for your consideration. You understand the position we legislators often find ourselves in.

Dr. James Hart, State Department of Health: I would like to speak in favor of 6056 on behalf of Commissioner Foote and the department. This bill would make a minor revision in the state law which was passed two years ago, section 53-41b, which would permit only a person licensed to practice medicine and surgery to pierce ears. The reason for this bill, or this law

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

THURSDAY

FEBRUARY 18, 1971

was that we had received many complaints over the years by physicians who stated that infections of the ears occurred in their practice, and in other states I understand more than simple infections, they've even had cases of tetanus, which is also lockjaw, and can cause death.

The reason for this bill this year is that it was found that the phrase - for remuneration - did impede the enforcement of this law, because it's quite difficult to decide at the local level whether a person is merely buying jewelry and getting a free piercing of the ears or otherwise. And furthermore, it will require that no one perform this operation which should only be done by a licensed physician and surgeon. And this bill of course was originally introduced and supported by the public health committee of the State Medical Society, and the state Health Department feels that in order that it can be enforced properly, that this particular act should pass.

Sen. Pac: Anyone else wishing to speak? The hearing of the Public Health and Safety Committee is closed. And - oh, I'll reopen it for a second, you may go on.

James Harrison, President, Conn. Society of Beauty Culture Schools inc., Director of the Modern School of Hair-dressing and Cosmetology, and also on the Board of Directors of the National School Association for the United States: I'd like to reaffirm Mr. Shaughnessy's bill, 5886, concerning manicurists. Now there is a definite need for additional services to be added in this particular realm for the simple reason that my lady has much trouble in trying to find a manicurist and also my friends the barbers have much trouble in trying to get these young ladies into the field. And also it does open another field for the minority groups to enter and be gainfully employed, so I think, in delivering your message to your committee, ask them to act very favorable on this. Thank you very much.

Sen. Pac: You're welcome. I think now we'll close this hearing.

Letter to the Committee on Public Health and Safety:

Because I will not be at the Capitol on February 18 I would appreciate your entering this letter in your records in support of HB 5890.