

<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 71-276		500	4	1	1
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Public Health &amp; Safety</i> 858-859</li> <li>• <i>Public Health &amp; Safety</i> 831-832</li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2513(Consent)</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1535</li> </ul>

**H-113**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

**VOL. 14  
PART 6  
2503-3010**

Wednesday, May 12, 1971 12.

State Commission to study and investigate the problems of deaf and hearing impaired persons; and on Page 4 of the Calendar, Calendar No. 814, Substitute for S.B. No. 0500, File No. 646, an Act concerning clarifying the definition of day care centers to exclude private as well as public schools. If there are no objections, I move the acceptance of the Joint Committees' favorable reports and passage of those items on the Consent Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

You heard the motion. Is there objection on the part of any individual Member at this time to any of the enumerated items being contained in the motion? If not, then the question's on acceptance and passage of the enumerated Bills. All those in favor will indicate by saying "aye". All those opposed. The Bills are passed.

JOHN D. PRETE:

Mr. Speaker, I move suspension of the rules for the immediate consideration of the Resolutions on the Consent Calendar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Question's on suspension for immediate consideration of the Consent Resolutions. Is there objection? Hearing none, the rules are suspended.

JOHN D. PRETE:

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the following Resolutions on the Consent Calendar: Calendar No. 914, H.J.R. No. 196, Resolution expressing sympathy on the death of AUSTIN DUNHAM BARNEY; Calendar No. 916, H.J.R. No. 199, Resolution congratulating JOHN TOLAND.

**S-79**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

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

May 5, 1971

Page 16

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 493. File No. 646. Favorable report of the joint committee on Public Health and Safety. Substitute Senate Bill 500. An Act Concerning Clarifying the Definition of Day Care Centers to Exclude Private as well as Public Schools.

SENATOR PAC:

Mr. President, I move the acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This bill would exclude from the definition of a child day care center any facilities which are part of a private or public school. A child day care center currently is licensed and comes under the regulations of the Health Department. And the school comes under the education department. This is where the problem occurs. This is supposed to clarify it. The section that clarifies is the exclusion that is contained in pre-kindergarten children. They would still come under the supervision of child day care centers. And they come under these provisions because if you look at the bill, it says, if any of these programs are held in public schools and they do not come under the provisions of this 10-188 then they do come under the provision of the child day care centers.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 504. File No. 657. Favorable report of the joint committee on Corrections, Welfare and Humane Institutions. Substitute Senate Bill 1461.  
~~An Act Concerning Leasing Powers of the Welfare Commissioner.~~

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC  
HEALTH  
AND  
SAFETY**

**PART 2  
492-901**

**1971**

## PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

APRIL 6, 1971

concerned with most of his time actually supervising vaccinations and so on. These kinds of health services I feel can be purchased as I indicated in the statement on the fee-for-service basis. Some of the preventive health requirements and requirements for environmental health I think do not necessarily have to be handled through the agency of a full-time health director who has an M.D. I feel that a person who's trained in statistics, who's trained in epidemiology, can do an equally as competent a job.

Rep. Lyons: Thank you.

Sen. Pac: Josephine Misi. Mr. Peck next.

Josephine Miser: I'm speaking to bill 500 (AN ACT CONCERNING CLARIFYING THE DEFINITION OF DAY CARE CENTERS TO EXCLUDE PRIVATE AS WELL AS PUBLIC SCHOOLS). I'm a day care program specialist with the licensing staff of the Maternal And Child Health section of the State Department of Health. There seems to be a discrepancy between the statement of purpose which was printed earlier, and the statement in the text of S.B. 500. Clarification one way or the other needs to be made concerning the grade levels in private schools to be excluded from licensing. In working out the final text of regulations governing day care centers, the promulgation of which is the responsibility of the Conn. Child Day Care Council, health department staff members worked with Senator Hammer in the statement of definition of child day care center. As approved in the regulations, by the regulations review committee last fall, child day care center is defined as not including "services to children enrolled in any non-public school in kindergarten through 12th grade, which school complies with the provisions of Section 10-188 of the General Statutes". We understand that the intent of S.B. 500 to be not to exclude pre-kindergarten programs in non-public schools from licensing by the state. And we feel that a statement specifying the grade levels should be included in the bill.

Sen. Pac: Any questions?

Rep. Cohen: Have you been associated with any state-owned, state-controlled day care center?

Miss Miser: We, yes, we license some of them.

Rep. Cohen: You do have some. Have you any idea of the cost per pupil or per child per year?

Miss Miser: There are, have been cost studies done by the Day Care Task Force and the amount varies from between \$2,000 - \$2,500 to \$3,000 per year.

Rep. Cohen: Per child.

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

extend your stay. The board assures us that our nursing educating institutions turn out a product which is well prepared to deal with people in sickness and in health. It doesn't bow to the pressure of special interest groups nor solve shortage problems by lowering the standards. It is charged with, to administer the law that you legislators passed in the interest of public safety and expectations.

In, to your question, in a neighboring state, the board has other than nurse members and effects, and the effects have been serious in the quality of nursing care. Now everyone else wants to get on that board. And I just can't believe that their interest is for quality nursing totally. It might be to alleviate the problems of obtaining less than standard personnel at a lower cost.

I bring to your attention in opposition of the State Medical Society and the Hospital Association of such an expansion. They have confidence in nurses. They have their experts and would hardly like for our nurses to sit on their boards.

I appeal to you to have faith in Connecticut nursing. It has renowned leaders which shall strengthen any known weaknesses in nursing, and continue to lead the nation in quality care.

Let us nurses do our own thing. We know what we are doing, for we have had a long and proud history of serving humanity. I've written this myself.

Sen. Pac: Thank you. Senator Hammer please.

Lucy Hammer, State Senator from the 12th District: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I just want to explain S.B. 500. There's nothing in this bill that is very drastic. It's simply a clarification of the present law and I'll explain briefly what had happened about it. This act that's presently on the statutes, is for licensing of day care centers. Now when the, I think they call it the Advisory Council on Day Care to the Health Department, brought in their regulations to the regulations review committee in the interim period, their regulations, because of the wording of the present law, it wasn't anything that they did in the regulations that brought this situation about, but because of the wording of the present law, their regulations, which were pretty strict for licensing and so on, and all the requirements for day care centers, would have applied to private schools the grades of private schools. And to the Montessori Schools. And the reason is this. The wording now is, now these are, these are the exemptions from this licensing provision and one of them is, facilities which are an integral part of the school system. Now it was thought when, I'm sure when this bill, this law was framed, that that meant an integral, an

integral part of any school system or kindergarten of any school would be exempt from these rules and regulations, but they're not. The Attorney-General ruled that the, that the school systems simply means and is limited to public schools. So we had quite a go-around with the Department of Health on this, with the regulations review committee, and we finally got them, 'cause naturally nobody wants to put the kindergartens or the parochial schools under the licensing of day care. This is entirely separate in our system. So we finally convinced Dr. Foote and his group over there that it would be, that he could put into the regulations something that would take care of this situation and exempt private schools, kindergarten and so on from the coverage of the law. And then I thought, well it's not, that's only a sort of temporary expedient. The best thing to do is to change the wording in the law. And that's all this does. It's to exempt the things we meant to exempt from (not clear).

Sen. Pac: All this trouble over a little change.

Sen. Hammer: Yes. Yes. Yes.

Sen. Pac: Thank you, Senator.

Sen. Hammer: I just want to make sure, there's been a lot of excitement over these day care regulations. And a lot of feeling about them. So I just want to make clear that this is nothing that changes anything. Thank you.

Sen. Pac: Agnes McCarthy.

Agnes McCarthy: I'm speaking for the Legislative Committee of the Conn. Nurses Association. We wish to go on record in opposition to H.B. 8708, an act concerning the composition of the state board of nurse examiners.

We consider that only professional nurses have the qualifications and experience to undertake such activities as:

1. Examining and evaluating those individuals applying for professional and practical nurse licensure.
2. Evaluating and accrediting the curriculum of all educational programs in nursing in this state.
3. Undertaking disciplinary action, when necessary, against nurses in the state.

We feel that this board of carefully selected nurses has worked conscientiously to improve standards set by and for nurses in Connecticut.

We would like to see our board of nurse examiners continue as they have been, actively coordinating with other health groups in the state. However, we feel that nursing has the self-determination to set standards and to evaluate their own practice.