

<b>Act Number</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Bill Number</b>	<b>Total Number of Committee Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of House Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of Senate Pages</b>
PA 71-228		8618	16	1	2
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Public Health &amp; Safety</i> 817-818</li> <li>• <i>Public Health &amp; Safety</i> 826-829</li> <li>• <i>Public Health &amp; Safety</i> 832</li> <li>• <i>Public Health &amp; Safety</i> 836-837</li> <li>• <i>Public Health &amp; Safety</i> 851-856</li> <li>• <i>Public Health &amp; Safety</i> 867-870</li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1978(<i>consent</i>)</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1623- 1624</li> </ul>

**H-112**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 5  
1968-2502**

Monday, May 3, 1971

11.

- Cal. 568, H.B. 5557, AN ACT CONCERNING THE RAILROAD GRADE AT FLATBUSH AVENUE IN THE TOWN OF WEST HARTFORD, File 556.
- Cal. 570, Sub. for H.B. 5656, AN ACT CONCERNING DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS ON THE BASIS OF SEX OR MARITAL STATUS, File 523.
- Cal. 576, Sub. for H.B. 6474, AN ACT CONCERNING THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF CONSERVATION OFFICERS, File 522.
- Cal. 577, H.B. 6781, AN ACT CONCERNING THE NAMING OF THE NEW ARMORY IN NORWALK, File 538.
- Cal. 578, Sub. for H.B. 6871, AN ACT CONCERNING REGULATIONS OF CASUALTY INSURANCE RATES, File 521.
- Cal. 585, Sub. for H.B. 8496, AN ACT CONCERNING NOTICE OF SPECIAL AND RECONVENED SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, File 539.
- Cal. 588, Sub. for H.B. 6503, AN ACT CONCERNING EXECUTION OF EJECTMENT ON FORECLOSURE JUDGMENT WHERE MORTGAGE HAS BEEN GUARANTEED BY ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS, File 552.
- Cal. 595, Sub. for H.B. 5258, AN ACT PROHIBITING UNWARRANTED INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF GENERAL ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS, F.533.
- Cal. 596, H.B. 5738, AN ACT CONCERNING RECOVERY OF CHILD WELFARE ASSISTANCE, File 531.
- Cal. 598, H.B. 7216, AN ACT AMENDING THE CHARTER OF THE UNIONVILLE WATER COMPANY REGARDING THE ISSUANCE OF BONDS, File 536.
- Cal. 607, Sub. for H.B. 8618, AN ACT CONCERNING OPENING BIRTH RECORDS FOR GENEALOGICAL RESEARCH, File 560.

roc

**S-79**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 4  
1457-1920**

May 7, 1971

Page 22

be postponed, particularly when these are held for minimum eligibility hearings. Committee felt it was a good bill and I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

CAL. 561. Favorable report of the Committee on Rules. Substitute House Bill 8496. An Act Concerning Notice of Special and Reconvened sessions of the General Assembly.

SENATOR BURKE:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This is an act concerning the notice of special and reconvened sessions of the General Assembly. The purpose of the bill is to change the requirement from mailing notice for reconvening the legislature from first class to registered certified return receipt requested. I move passage.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 562. File 560. Favorable report of the joint committee on Public Health and Safety. Substitute House Bill 8618. An Act Concerning Opening Birth Records for Genealogical Research.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill would permit the members of any

May 7, 1971

Page 23

legally incorporated genealogical society to have access to the vital statistics that are held by our local registrars or the State Department of Health. It's a help in pursuing their hobby. I think it's of more interest than that. A great many of us are interested in our identity in this world and this is one way of finding out. One of the problems, of course, is regarding illegitimacy but in this respect, I think you have a law on the books that says, that the putative father is not listed unless it's with his consent. And of course, the mother's name is never mentioned also. I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

MATTERS RETURNED FROM LEGISLATIVE COMMISSIONER:

CAL. NO. 144. Favorable report of the committee on Finance. Substitute House Bill 5466. An Act Concerning Interest Due On Delinquent Sewer Assessments. As Amended by House Amendment A and Senate Amendment A.

SENATOR ALFANO:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill merely provides in the event of a delinquency in the payment of one sewer assessment, that it does not accelerate all the other assessments. This would provide that one sewer assessment would bare interest and the other assessments in the remaining years, would not be accelerated.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage of the bill, will you remark further? If not, ~~all those in favor say, "aye". Opposed, "nay". The bill is passed.~~

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC  
HEALTH  
AND  
SAFETY**

**PART 2  
492-901**

**1971**

## PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

SENATOR STANLEY J. PAC  
and  
REP. MORRIS N. COHEN  
presiding

Members present: Senators: Pac, Gunther, Hammer  
Representatives: Cohen, Lyons, Connolly, Rose, Clarke,  
Clark, Stroffolino, Martin, DiMeo, Iwanicki, Miller.

Rep. Cohen: The hearing is open. Any legislator who'd like to speak?

Rep. Hanzalek from the 40th District: I would like to speak to you this morning about bill #8618 introduced by Representative Thornton. It's an ACT CONCERNING OPENING BIRTH RECORDS FOR GENEALOGICAL RESEARCH.

Some time ago I believe you heard another bill on that subject, 6221 was its number. And at the time I received a letter from a genealogist who was most disappointed in the provisions of that bill and who, I'm sure, if he could be here to testify today, would testify in favor of H.B. 8618. The thrust of this bill, and it won't cost a single penny to the State, so this might be one we can pass this year, but the thrust of it is to permit legally incorporated, or members of legally incorporated genealogical societies, to examine records of vital statistics. Before this they were not permitted to do it. And this is a great, has been a great source of difficulty. Dr. Byam, whom I shall quote, is a Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins. He's a member of the Conn. Society of Genealogists and also the New England Historic Genealogical Society. He says that compared with other states, Connecticut is conspicuously backward. All the states that I have dealt with, he says, have supplied for fee the birth records requested. In New Hampshire and Vermont all vital records are open to the public. It is deplorable that Connecticut in so many ways progressive, should remain illiberal with regard to its vital records. Genealogy is considered a handmaiden of history. The state's present law obstructs genealogical research and consequently the advance of history.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

In House Bill 8618, the birth records, vital statistics, will be open not only to chief executive officers of municipalities but also attorneys and title examiners, but would also now be open to members of legally incorporated genealogical societies. At this point you could look into genealogical records that were filed prior to January 1, 1970, but it's high time that perhaps it was possible to look into records of a more recent date. Thank you very much.

Rep. Cohen: Any questions of the representative? Thank you very much. In case the machine isn't working do you want to leave that statement? In case the machines isn't working.

Rep. Hanzalek: Sure.

Rep. Cohen: Do you think it's working? (not clear) Representative Connolly would you care to (not clear).

Rep. Connolly from the 39th: I would like to speak in favor, House Bill 8705 (AN ACT CONCERNING THE REMOVAL OF THE REMAINS OF DECEASED PATIENTS) which will not cost the state any money but has a very humane purpose. It's an act concerning the removal of the remains of deceased patients. This problem was brought to my attention because of the problem that arises in convalescent homes, in multiple bed wards where there are very often aged patients. Should a patient in bed four or five of a six bed ward expire, very often the body is left there much to the detriment of the mental health of the other surrounding aged patients. I would like to see the State Department of Health require some provision from the convalescent hospitals to have the body removed immediately from the multiple bed ward and possibly moved to a holding room at the rear of the facility until the remains can be picked up. Thank you very much.

May I just please add also my approval also of House Bill 8618. I too have had correspondence from the Genealogical Society and I would urge your passage of bill 8618 as well as my own bill, House Bill 8705. Thank you very much.

Rep. Rose from the 69th District: Mr. Chairman, members of the Public Health and Safety Committee, speaking for substitute bill 5378 which is entitled Voluntary Sterilization of women who have given birth to two or more children. The business of illegitimate children has been removed from the original bill and we, matter of welfare statement on the original bill has been changed in order to (not clear) the objections of many people that have written in in connection with this piece of legislation, although it was not intended in any way to discriminate or to pick out any particular class of people, in our society, it was so interpreted by a great many people that I was perhaps, in this bill, concentrating on just those people who are on welfare or those people who had illegitimate children. I did not intend it to be that way and so I have submitted a voluntary, a substitute bill which does not refer

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

would contain the various requirements. And I think that this would -

Rep. Cohen: We would have to set up some (not clear).

Rep. King: Would have to set up a residency requirement.

Rep. Cohen: Any other questions of Rep. King? Thank you very much.

Sen. Pac: Herbert A. Hotchkiss.

Herbert A. Hotchkiss: I live at 1184 Trout Book Drive, West Hartford, Connecticut. I would like to present reasons why I favor the passage of H.B. 8618, an act concerning opening birth records for genealogical research.

In the State of Connecticut birth records since 1850 have been made unavailable to genealogists, both amateur and professional. This practice has been very discriminatory in nature to those many thousands of Americans who have been interested in the hobby of genealogy and wish to establish "roots" back to their ancestors. Most of these people have been trying for years to trace through the intervening years from 1850 to the present back to the very excellent records in the State Library that, State Library that will back, finally tie their "roots" to the pioneers of this country. More than most any other state we find that Connecticut was the birthplace of the families that made the history of this country.

Presently birth control, birth record information is limited after 1850 to inquiries concerning immediate members of the searcher's family and then only after the custodian has ascertained that confidential information has been segregated from view although this information constitutes a very small percentage of the total compiled.

I feel that this confidential information should be separately filed by each Town Clerk or Board of Health so that someday there will be no question about availability of birth records on a right-to-know basis. Once this is accomplished the Barbour Collection of births, marriages and deaths in the State Library can be expanded to include the records subsequent to 1850.

A large number of the people interested in genealogy as a hobby are the retired and elderly although there is an increasingly large number of the middle aged and young that are trying to establish "roots" to their pioneer ancestors. One of the problems today is that the young of this state and country have difficulty relating to their fathers, mothers and grandparents and because of lack of knowledge of their contributions to the growth of this state and country do not have

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

the feeling of belonging that is needed to keep families together.

For many years I and members of the Hotchkiss family association have been attempting to accumulate the information needed (mostly from 1850 on) to complete and publish a genealogy of our family to join the many other family genealogies, most of which cover information prior to 1900. Passage of this bill will assist all genealogists as well as historians because people make history. Thank you.

Sen. Pac: Any questions?

Rep. Cohen: I was going to ask what if some person finally unearthed the fact that somebody's grandparents were hung as horse thieves or something. What happens to those facts? Are they made public or will they be kept - how do we protect the public?

Mr. Hotchkiss: We are not interested in confidential information of that nature. And first of all I do not believe in birth records they record the fact that a person is hung for a horse thief, sir.

Rep. Lyons, 149th: Well, let's get to a, then something that would be on the birth record, sir. Let's assume that (not clear) there's been an illegitimate birth. I don't think that this is really, the, the general public or any particular society should have privy to that information.

Mr. Hotchkiss: Sir, when I refer to confidential information, that's what I was referring to. We know that this is something we have no - in fact illegitimacy in genealogy is not even considered. We do not consider illegitimacy, make any record of them. This information as far as we're concerned is confidential and privileged information to the family itself who knows about it. And the only people that would be entitled to know that information would be such members of the immediate family who would have to establish a birth for official records.

Rep. Lyons: Well, I, don't misunderstand me. I appreciate your, your position and I think it's a good one and it's an interesting one and I think a lot of us would like to find out a little bit more about our ancestors. The thing that bothers me as a legislator is that there are confidential records along with birth records and I, I appreciate your point too, if they could be separated fine, but if we were to go back now and try to separate all the birth records say from tomorrow on down, you know the cost would be astronomical. So I don't know how you really are going to, are going to go back and have somebody separate the confidential information from the information that you have been looking for.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

Mr. Hotchkiss: Well, as the representative who spoke first I believe here today stated, the, there is a means in other states of this information being separated from the public record by supervision of the local official. Now -

Rep. Lyons: In conjunction with your investigation you mean.

Mr. Hotchkiss: That's right. In other words they usually do ascertain the situation as far as the birth status of these people that are being inquired about. Now up in the other states which I won't speak as an authority and others will on this bill, you will find that there are means and methods that they have developed which have been proven satisfactory and do not result in this information being published for derogatory or any other means.

Rep. Lyons: Mr. Hotchkiss, if you could get the committee that information, or a copy of it -

Mr. Hotchkiss: I think it will be avail -

Rep. Lyons: Some indication of what type of legality they have in other states that we could look at, it may be helpful.

Mr. Hotchkiss: We will get that. Of course it's very unfortunate the one who is very knowledgeable on this subject, Mr. George Williams, has gone on vacation to Mexico, so he's unavailable. But other members of societies that I do belong to, speaking as individuals, will be speaking on this subject, and possibly inform you on it, and we will get the additional information shortly.

Rep. Lyons: Thank you.

Rep. Clarke, 158th, Stamford: I was going to bring up that same point. I wondered what the procedure would be and whether someone's, some official would look into it first. Of course that would mean a great deal of work and more money, I'm sure, but -

Mr. Hotchkiss: Well, usually a custodian is responsible for custody of the records, whether they be a town clerk or a -

Rep. Clarke: I wonder how they would set up, files or (inaudible)

Mr. Hotchkiss: Well, there isn't actually that much activity because they would be looking for specific items when they go for this information and that's usually a link that would tie them in with the records that are presently in existence at the Bar - at the State Library up to 1850.

Rep. Clarke: I'm sympathetic with the progress because I have friends who (not clear) I'm not in on it myself, but.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

Rep. Cohen: Mr. Hotchkiss, Mr. Hotchkiss, in the first section 1, says all records of vital statistics including births, marriages and deaths. Is that included in your bill? To be open to your organization?

Mr. Hotchkiss: Yes, sir.

Rep. Cohen: And deaths (not clear)

Mr. Hotchkiss: Well, deaths, deaths and, deaths and marriages are now open anyway I believe.

Rep. Cohen: But they're not open, be open to your organization.

Mr. Hotchkiss: No, the birth, the births would be the ones that are not open presently. I don't think it states in here but from my understanding marriages and deaths are open to the public.

Sen. Pac: Any other questions? Thank you, sir. Please let's have a little quiet. It's difficult to record the testimony. Michael P. Deasy? And Josephine L. Misi next.

Michael P. Deasy: I'm from the Town of Branford. I am the CDAP co-ordinator for the town. I'm speaking in behalf of the Town of Branford as well as the task force organized under the CDAP programs to speak and to plan for health and social services. I'm addressing myself to bills 8699, 8700 and 8707.

As an introduction I'd like to indicate that the Town of Branford is currently engaged in a survey with four other towns in the East Shore district, east of New Haven, to consider the establishment of a regional health district. And insofar as these data are not in yet but the town stands a likelihood of at least establishing such a district, the three bills I've indicated would be of some assistance to the Town of Branford as well as the other towns in the area.

First of all with regard to bill 8699. This bill will make it possible for a person properly trained in public health with a Master's degree in Public Health, to become a municipal health director. It is well known that standard medical education includes little or no public health study or experience. The physician shortage is already severe and private practice is much more lucrative than public health physicians. Many towns cannot afford a full-time physician-director if these salaries range from \$30-\$40, 000 a year. This is certainly true of the town I represent. A large portion of health director's responsibilities have to do with environmental matters for which most practicing physicians have few qualifications. Environmental matters are a significant part of the public health work. Those actual medical services a

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

Miss Miser: Per child. This is for all costs. You know -

Rep. Cohen: Including the cost of the building?

Miss Miser: Everything, you pro rating - staffing.

Rep. Cohen: Who can put the actual figures on it?

Miss Miser: The Day Care Task Force, I think. It's Horace Brown is the Chairman of the, he's from the Bureau of Finance and Control, State Planning, Office of State Planning. They have the -

Rep. Cohen: Thank you.

Sen. Pac: Thank you. Mr. Peck. Irene Smith next.

Brainerd T. Peck: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I live in the Town of Morris. I wish to register in behalf of H.B. 8618, an act concerning opening birth records for genealogical research. H.B. 6221, an act concerning the examination of birth records, would merit favorable consideration as an alternate bill.

A great many people, including myself, compile their family records as a hobby. Some of us are able to obtain such records from published books and periodicals which are beyond the reach of statutory censorship. For those not so situated, the inability to identify a grandparent or great grandparent, and so forth from the municipal vital records seems an unnecessary hardship. The only source of information for some families are the vital records in the town offices. That's a special problem for people whose families have been in this country for not more than three or four generations. As evidence of that I have a copy of a letter from the The New York Public Library which would be elaborated on later which says the following: a large percentage of our readers are second and third generation Americans endeavoring to ascertain the arrival and place of origin of their immigrant ancestors. The largest percentage of individuals researching coats-of-arms are second or third generation Italians and Irish.

The usual objection to public access to birth records in local or state offices of vital records is that an occasional entry might reveal an illegitimate birth or an adoption. The hobby genealogist is not interested in snooping for objectional material, which should have always been kept separate from the rest of the birth records, as now required by law in some of the states.

Both bills would make available to the general public birth records on the books for 100 years or more. In that way, persons now living would not be involved.

I urge the Committee to take favorable action on either of these bills.

## PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

Sen. Pac: Any questions? Thank you.

Mr. Radulski: Righto.

Sen. Pac: Benjamin P. Richardson. John Tilson next.

Benjamin P. Richardson from Old Greenwich, Connecticut: Sen. Pac and Rep. Dr. Morris, Ladies and Gentlemen. I appear before you as an individual and voice my own opinions. The Board of Certification of Genealogists of Washington, D.C. has certified me as "genealogical record searcher".

My interest is to ascertain facts relating to my ancestors, oh, I didn't mention I'm speaking on HB 8618 - and those of my family, and occasionally to assist to a limited degree others, never for a fee.

Frank E. Bradley Jr. an author on genealogy, a staff member, genealogical section New York City Public Library, able to research records in five languages wrote me March 11, 1971 advising that:

- a. interest in genealogy is now second only to stamp collecting as a hobby.
- b. a large percentage of readers to New York Public Library are second and third generation Americans, endeavoring to ascertain the arrival and place of origin of their immigrant ancestors.
- c. the largest percentage of individuals researching costs-of-arms are of Italian and Irish descent.

I have searched records in all the New England states. In only Conn. and one other have I been restricted in searching the birth records of the era of my interest.

In Conn. the towns I have done research in, the town official received me most graciously, conducted me to the vault, shown where various indexes and records are shelved, instructed me as to the rules, assigned a work'space, assured me to feel free to ask questions - and left me. I have tried to keep my questions to a minimum so as not to interrupt a very busy town official.

I suggest to this committee that if HB 8618 becomes law and that birth records are on the same basis as marriage and death records to members of legally incorporated Genealogical Societies less interruptions would be required of these busy public officials.

Sen. Pac: Any questions? Thank you. John Tilson. Herbert Anderson next.

## PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

Paul W. Prindle of Darien, Connecticut: I'm a Fellow of the American Society of Genealogists, a member of the Stamford Genealogical Society, and a contributing editor to the American Genealogist.

8618

I have just two points to make rather briefly. First, and without beating a dead horse, I want to illustrate the wide, general interest in genealogy just by showing you this publication which is, which has something like 20,000 subscribers. It's filled with queries and answers and articles of interest. That's just to illustrate how widespread the interest is.

Secondly, it was brought out a little while ago that penalties might be provided for the publication of illegitimate births or other items of like nature. If such penalties are provided for in this act, I think they should be limited to publication of such illegitimate births as occurred within the last hundred years, prior to the publication itself. Anyone who would be concerned too much about one of his ancestors hundreds of years ago being an illegitimate child is, has very little grounds to stand on. I boast of the fact that I have one back in Massachusetts in 1714. It adds a little human interest and spice to family history. I might also point out that it is actually a society of descendants of bastard sons of the kings of England. People are happy to join that, so that illegitimacy when it occurs back in your history is not a, not a disgrace.

Sen. Pac: Any questions?

Rep. Miller: Yes, I have a question of Mr. Prindle. Are there any other people outside the genealogists who are interested in this? People who are (not clear).

Mr. Prindle: Well, I wouldn't, I'm, being a genealogists I don't know what others do. I think if there are, they are very few. There is a company called Tracers Inc. in New York that looks for missing persons, usually for unclaimed bank accounts or perhaps estate purposes. But I would say they are relatively very, very minor. Incidentally, there's been talk about the difficulty and the cost of segregating illegitimate births from normal births in the town records. If this penalty were imposed, it would be no change in the present records and no additional expense whatsoever.

Sen. Pac: Any other questions? Thank you, sir. Sister Catherine. Laura Lebel next.

Sister Catherine: Members of the Committee and ladies and gentlemen, I speak in opposition to House Bill 8708 from several years experience as a member of the Conn. State Board of Examiners to Nursing. I consider it essential for members to be professional registered nurses in order to provide for the

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

correct interpretation and implementation of the present statutes. Nurses should control the practice of their own profession. I would also like to suggest to the members of the committee that Anne McGuigan, who is the Chief Nursing Examiner, has prepared testimony and possibly if she could be heard before many others who are here, it would clarify many of the issues.

Sen. Pac: Has she signed the register?

Sister Catherine: Yes.

Sen. Pac: We'll hear her in just a little while.

Sister Catherine: Thank you.

Sen. Pac: Laura Lebel. H.B. Hubbell next.

Laura Lebel: I'm speaking for the faculty of the Waterbury Hospital School of Nursing in regard to H.B. 8708. The faculty of the Waterbury Hospital School of Nursing, numbering twenty registered, professional nurses and five non-nurse educators, wish to go on record as opposing H.B. 8708. It is our feeling that the licensing board for members of a professional discipline should be composed of members of said discipline, or said profession. It is our feeling that the inclusion of non nurses on the board of examiners would serve to lower the standards of the profession and would provide less protection for the public than is now afforded.

Sen. Pac: Thank you, ma'am. H.B. Hubbell. Penfield Mead.

Penfield Mead from Stamford: To speak on 8618, the birth record matter. And I have a petition. I think you have some others. I don't really have much to add except in regard to the question Mr. Lyons raised, the penalty provision. I would personally have no objection to this, but I would like to see some word other than just objectionable used. Certainly should be limited to illegitimacy or something of this nature. Thank you.

Sen. Pac: Thank you, sir. Hal Burdo.

Harold Burdo, from the State Department of Health, Public Health Statistics: And I'd like to speak against bill 8618. I speak against just the amendment that they have the members of legally incorporated genealogical societies. I think it'd be somewhat difficult for us to administer a program that would define a legally incorporated genealogist. We have some problems now in restricting access to birth records with other parts of this particular law, specifically a title examiner. You don't really know what they are. They're not registered and they come in and say they're a title examiner and they can get a record. The towns, the townships in Conn.

## PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

well, it depends. Here you go through a variety of procedures. The larger towns will restrict access to records regardless of a birth, death or marriage record. The smaller towns, the town clerk may have the time and will, on, on her own investigate a record for a genealogist. One of the problems we run into, and this would be directed specifically to the gentleman of the 156th - he said, you know, are there any other people who could possibly want a record. Yes, there are. Those of us who are on the state level recognize that there are elements in the society that would need a birth record for other uses except to trace their genealogical ancestry. We get directors every day from the Federal government indicating to us that such and such an organization, there will be certain people looking for a pass, a passport. And we would not have, I suppose, rather an esteemed position that Conn. is one of the few states in the union that has one of the most restricted vital registries that one can get into. And personally I'd like to maintain this, this position.

I don't object to genealogists doing the research per se, if we could define precisely who they are and under what circumstances they're doing business. The penalty provision that was mentioned before, I don't know how that would work. I don't know whether we'd be in a position to impose a sufficient enough penalty on the damage that theoretically one could create by having access to a specific record. Any questions?

Sen. Pac: Any questions? Thank you, sir.

Rep. Rose: You did mention that you already have problems of those who are allowed to apply and get, so why, how come that you have problems about titleists. This can't be controlled? If it can't be controlled, then why discriminate against so-called genealogists?

Mr. Burdo: Representative, it's a situation that if you're going to restrict access to a few, then it's a situation you should restrict it to everyone. Now there are some - it says clearly again that we can provide a free copy to a state or federal agency. Many states, a county government is in fact the state agency. So we ask them to clarify this. A title examiner we will ask them to clarify. Who is he examining for? In most cases it's for an attorney who's doing a search on property. We'll get it from attorneys who will say they're representing so and so. And once again these people are registered with the bar. A physician will be registered with the AMA and etc. etc. But a genealogist, you can't pinpoint it.

Sen. Pac: Any other questions? Thank you, sir. A. F. McGuigan.

Anne F. McGuigan: I'm the Chief Nursing Examiner for the Board of Examiners for Connecticut. I have, the Board has asked me to prepare testimony in substantiation of our opposition to House bill 8708, which is to the composition of the State

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

Board of Examiners for Nursing. It is to include a physician, hospital administrator, and two members of the public. And I know that you people are busy and I have prepared mimeographed material all written out which might be easier for each member of the committee to go over in committee rather than taking the time of every one to go over some of the things that have already been said, relative to the opposition for this bill.

Sen. Pac: Thank you.

Rep. Cohen: Could I ask you a question?

Anne McGuigan: Yes.

Rep. Cohen: This does not necessarily imply that I'm against the proposal, but just for information. One of the proponents, or opponents of the bill said it would lower the standards if a physician for example were on the board. Why would it necessarily lower the standards? It might raise the standards.

Anne McGuigan: I do not know the reason for them saying it would lower the standards, but I believe the reason for having, the opposition to having other people would be that there would be interest groups represented. And the Board of Examiners for Nursing is not a committee composed of interest groups for this and for that. And therefore I do not know the reasons for the lowering of the standards, but this is the reason we object. It is not a group of interested people who would come in and say this is for this group or for that group.

Rep. Cohen: Well, would a hospital superintendent be a disinterested person? He's constantly dealing with nurses so he's not a disinterested person. Neither would a physician be a disinterested person because he too is constantly dealing with nurses. So again I pose that question for my information.

Anne McGuigan: I do not know the reason for the individual making this statement. I have not made the statement that they would lower the standards. I only meant that it would become a group of people with interests other than nursing, and the Board of Examiners for Nursing is not a committee to provoke good will between nurses and other agencies. It is to examine and determine the qualifications of nurses to practice for the good of the public.

Sen. Pac: Thank you. William Shockley.

Bill Shockley: I'm a third year law student at the University of Conn. School of Law. And I'm here to speak in favor of bill 1707 an act regulating the sale and use of hazardous surface coatings

## PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

I drafted the bill so I'll be able to answer any of your questions on some of the provisions it contains, but firstly I'd like to point out several things. The bill doesn't cost the state any money. It's designed to pay for itself. It hits directly at the heart of the lead-based paint problem by restricting the source of the paint. A man will not be able to go to a store and buy leaded paint and use it ignorant of the serious possibilities, the serious hazards, any more, under this bill. There's minimal interference with the legitimate users of leaded paint. There's minimal cost to those users. The fees are as they're set up now, they're \$2 for owners of boats and \$10 for painting companies. The provision for separate storage and separate display of hazardous surface coatings attempt to take care of the problem of lack of knowledge on the part of the public. The - there is a possibility that non-leaded primers will be more expensive than leaded primers. In my estimation based on seven years experience with a painting contractor it might go as high as \$1 a gallon difference. But this \$1 a gallon I think must be compared to the cost of de-leading a child, which is \$3000; cost of keeping a child in a mental retardation home for the length of his life, which is \$250,000. And that's ignoring the element of human misery which also comes in.

I'd like to point out that the state is, to my knowledge that the state doesn't have any direct interest in paint manufacture. I don't believe there are any paint manufacturers in this state. The standard which is incorporated in the act comes from the American National Standards Association which was formerly known as United States of America Standards Institute. I wrote the standards into the act to avoid the problem which we have now. The United States of America Standards Institute standards are incorporated into our statutes, but they do not exist any more. They've changed their name to American National Standards so it'd be difficult for a person new to a particular field to find out what the standard is.

I have one other comment. For my purposes I think it's important that we limit the use, prohibit the use, on the exterior as well as the interior of dwellings. The problem as I see it is one of the ignorant user, the person who buys the paint maybe to use on the outside of his house, has a half a gallon left over and ends up painting a crib with it, painting a rail, painting a sill. And I think it's important to keep the paint out of the hands of people who don't know how to use it.

Sen. Pac: Any questions? Thank you. Richard Tomlinson.

Richard G. Tomlinson: I live at 68 April Drive in Glastonbury, Conn. I wish to make brief remarks in favor of H.B. 8618, an act concerning opening birth records for genealogical research

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

The proposed state budget for 1971-72 includes \$1.4 million for state library operations. Much of this money goes for the operation of the very fine facilities across the street from here, which include one of the finest genealogical libraries in the country, containing more than 5,000 published family genealogies.

It is ironic that the State of Connecticut provides these library facilities on the one hand, and on the other hand places severe obstacles in the path of those of us who would like to publish the books that go on the shelves of the library. The current restrictive law, which has now been in effect for twenty-five years, works a special hardship on young people who have only recently developed an interest in their family origins. This is particularly true for those whose immigrant ancestors arrived in this country within the last 100 years, since the vital records prior to 1850 have been published. I feel that every man has a right to the information in public records which relates to his family. This can be done without violating any desire the state may have to bar access to records of illegitimate births. The proposed bill is one of many possible solutions. I urge its passage.

I'd like to make another comment too. The present law for the information of those who aren't familiar with it, does provide access for lawyers and for title searchers. Any one can be a title searcher. So the law as it stands now is discriminatory. And we are asking that the records be available also for genealogical research. We're willing to accept any safeguards with regard to illegitimate births as we have no interest in illegitimate births. I do not understand the references to sinister things which might flow from the access to birth records as Conn. is the only state which feels the need to respond to these sinister forces.

Sen. Pac: Any questions? Thank you, sir. Ray Lyddy.

Raymond Lyddy of Bridgeport representing the Conn. State Medical Society  
May I have an aside before I comment on the bills. I was interested in all the comments by the gentleman earlier sterilization. And as I've said before I wonder where, they were when I needed them before my wife had nine children. Less Senator Gunther comes back and makes a tape of this brings it home, I just want to say I'm only kidding.

The Conn. State Medical Society would like to go in opposition to S.B. 1652 and H.B. 8702. We have ourselves before to these particular problems suffice to say that the arguments we have used would use again in that basically these apply

## PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

Raymond Krollett: I'm here to speak on the bill, I'm here to speak on the gen, the bill concerning the unlocking of the birth records for the genealogists, number 8618. Now I, my present occupation, I work in the house but my present occupation, I am engaged in a field of tracing of missing persons. And one of my specialties, I locate missing heirs. Now I strongly urge the passage of this bill because we have a lot of people that has a lot of money coming. And they cannot get this money because I cannot get at the birth records. I cannot get at these records so I could get and find these people that's got this money coming. Now I appear here in 1969. At that time the number of the bill was 5419. And I'm kind of sorry that Dr. Franklin Foote isn't here because when I appeared at this hearing, and I was at the back of the room and I came down and they said I want to talk to you, you're pretty fired up about this bill. Well, all I can hear is all the wrong and all the inconvenience this would cause, cause these departments. Well let's tell you what good that the genealogists and the missing persons do. During my 8½ years of experience as a tracer of missing persons and affiliated with genealogy, we have got people who, got people pensions or government pensions and social security and different kinds of pensions that people were eligible for as widows and stuff like that. And we traced records and all this stuff like that and a lot of people would have had to go on relief. Now there were a lot of people who have a lot of money coming and today have to go on relief, have to live in poverty. There's a lot of people who are the richest people on the poor farms because of the fact that they do not get the benefits of this money. Now the genealogists and the tracers of missing persons have been working throughout the United States to try to get these bills going and get these, get these people. Now in the last, the last year that I appeared I am willing to sit down with these department heads in the state and sit down and let's fix up a system and get a system going. Now my argument here is that when they say, when these departments say Oh, you're going to foul up the record, this is going to happen and that's going to happen, there is something wrong with the administration. There is something wrong with the system. And this is what I say, I'll - it's about time when you go into these places. I don't mean to cause an infringement on their rights or on anything like that, but when you go into these places, these people treat you like you're working for them. And these people are working for the taxpayer. And believe me we are fired up about this bill because I've been at this thing for a long time. And I have been tracing people. I go to the cemetery and all these places looking through, for heirs and different things because I can't go to the birth certificate. Now I have people that's got a lot of money. There's billions of dollars in the United States alone where it is laying on the shelves because of the fact that we can't go through these

APRIL 6, 1971

52  
MBG

TUESDAY

records. Now I, I say this. Now another thing on this genealogy. They say, well a lot of people just like to trace and come in and they like to waste our time and they like to look through records. And, and - well, I'm not going to waste their time and I'm not there to waste anybody else's times because I know that no matter where you go, into a probate court or whether you go into records, you will find that people from all over the world are coming into our probate courts and they search our records and if we cannot produce the relatives or the heirs, they come down and they bring these people into this country and they get the money and they send back to the country, send it back to the other countries. Now there are poor people in this country that need this money and, and, and stuff like that. And if the people in other places don't, other countries don't get it it lies on the shelf. Now I mean this is an unfortunate thing and I don't mean to get boisterous about the thing but I've been on this thing and I've been engaged in missing persons. I've been affiliated before I became a tracer, I've been affiliated with private investigating firms, and I've been affiliated with firms in which we have (not clear) trace heirs and places like that, things like that. And we have done a lot of good. And the genealogists and the tracers of missing persons, they're honorable people. And, and I'm a former member of the National Society of Genealogists. I'm a former member of Connecticut Society of Genealogists and I am registered with the, with the Ledyard Historical Society, and I sincerely believe the passage of this bill, I was here twice, and I'm willing to come back again and again and again, because I believe, I know that there are in this country, our systems, we are very backward in a lot of ways and we've got to improve this, and I am willing to sit down with, with anybody and sit down with Mr. Foote. I explained this thinking before. I realize he has a problem because he says that, you know, on account of 1941, the alarming rate of illegal births and stuff like that. But I think there should be some modification. We got a State Library which I'm registered with the State Library over there and I do all this stuff and a lot of cases are referred to me and a lot of cases I have to refuse. I have to refuse these cases because of the fact that I can't get these records. I had a case right here in Hartford, Conn. where a woman had \$3,000 and badly needed it, these people badly needed it. And, and I couldn't because I could not search these records. There should be some modifications. These societies will get together. They will sit down. And they will prepare these things so we can get these things ready and the people will get the benefit of, of the thing. In foreign countries, they laugh at foreign countries, but believe me, gentlemen, they are far ahead of us. Thank you very much.

Sen. Pac: Thank you. Did you want to speak?

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

Neal Cordon, Executive Director of the Conn. Food Storage Association: Just like to comment briefly on two bills. The first, H.B. 88827, 8827 (AN ACT CONCERNING PUBLICIZING OF DATE CODES USED ON FOODS AND FOOD PRODUCTS), calling for publicizing date codes used on foods and food products. To me this looks like an impossible bill to, for any state agency, and this bill calls for the Department of Consumer Protection to regulate, enforce. Think when you stop and figure that there's 95% of the packaged food coming into Conn. from other states, and this involves some 5 or 6,000 different items, you can see the magnitude of the problem. Now at the moment, Congress is debating and having hearings on a, an all-encompassing code which would certainly handle this thing much better than we could have at state level. As a matter of fact, the trade press reported this morning that the food industry has reached an agreement with the Congressional committee on a code. So I think that's going to take care of that problem. The retailer doesn't know what the code means himself on thousands of items.

The other bill, 1694 (AN ACT REQUIRING FOOD AND BEVERAGE HANDLERS TO OBTAIN A CERTIFICATE OF HEALTH), calls for a license, certificate of health for food handlers. This apparently would affect the back room operations of the supermarkets where they'd be preparing meats for display and cold cuts and so forth. This bill or similar bills have been before this committee for twenty years that I've been around here. And I always remember the Public Health Director of New Britain who used to appear in opposition to these bills and he used to entertain the committee by telling of his days as Director of Public Health at Portland, Maine I believe it was. The gist of his testimony was always to the effect that you can give a license to a person today and they become infected tomorrow. And it's just not an effective way of handling it. And that was the approach to that problem at all times. As a matter of fact he used to shock some of the gals on the committee by telling they used to license the prostitutes in Portland, Maine but the incidence of infection went up because it gave everybody a feeling of security and that made the situation just worse. So that's been the history of that bill in the twenty years it's been kicking around here. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Richard Hubert from Greenwich: I'm a member of the Stamford Genealogical Society, also the National Genealogical Society, and I would like to speak in favor of bill 8618. I have very little to add to what already has been said, but I endorse all of it.

But there's just one or two more things. The keepers of the records have very little time to answer questions or help

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

people. I know in Greenwich that I have seen records and letters that have been written in October that they didn't have time to answer in January. And this is quite a burden I think on the, the clerk, town clerk. And if people are allowed to go in and look themselves, wouldn't be as many questions as there are. It would save time. And we feel that they are public records and it has been said that genealogists surely do some good in the world and we'd like very much to see this open.

Sen. Pac: Thank you very much.

Mrs. Hubert: And just one other thing. You asked how can you tell a genealogist. Well they all have cards. This is a card from the National Genealogical. And every organization issues a card so they could be very easily identified by the cards. Thank you.

###