

HB 8009

PA 587

1971

Insurance & Real Estate 373, 374, 375

House 2918 - 2919

Senate 3103 - 3114

17 ~~46~~

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**INSURANCE
AND
REAL ESTATE**

1-379

**1971
Index**

35cap
MONDAY

INSURANCE AND REAL ESTATE

APRIL 12, 1971

Mr. Stamm: May I respond?

Sen. Dinielli: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Stamm: Very briefly because the point, it also is a good one, most conversion plans are based on hospitalization only. Semi-private room rate and increments of \$5 or \$10 which a person may collect. In no event do we offer the full semi-private rate on an individual conversion policy. Now Mr. Johnson just remarked about another problem one which is major medical coverage and long term disability. Now these are areas that are even more costly to provide than the basic hospitalization benefits. And further lend themselves to abuse of anti-selection for example. If we were required to write or provide medical catastrophe or long term disability the fellow that was laid off would likely purchase a long term disability insurance and indeed may have an immediate need for that. So I can only comment that the rates for this kind of thing particularly for someone who was laid off and has no source of income would be inordinately high. Probably far beyond their reach.

Sen. Dinielli: Thank you Mr. Stamm. Any other speakers on this bill? HB-8379. If not we will go to HB-6516 AN ACT TO REQUIRE REPRESENTATION OF A PHARMACIST ON BOARDS OF HOSPITAL SERVICE CORPORATIONS. Anyone in favor? Opposed?

John S. Murtha, Counsel to Connecticut Blue Cross: We also are opposed to this legislation for the reason that it would introduce the element into the Directorship of, the Board of Directors of Connecticut Blue Cross, of a private interest, a special interest. And as I stated previously in connection with two of the prior bills, it is the desire of Connecticut Blue Cross to retain a Board of Directors which represents the public at large. No special interests. Therefore we oppose the concept and the principle behind this bill.

Sen. Dinielli: Thank you. Are there any other speakers? HB-8009 AN ACT CONCERNING PAYMENT BY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPORATIONS FOR SERVICES OF CHIROPRACTORS. In favor?

Mr. Orio, West Haven: It has been my personal experience that the chiropractors in their particularly specified limited field do the jobs better than medical doctors. If necessary I could offer evidence of doctors who go to chiropractors on Wednesday their day off for bad backs. And I think it is about time the chiropractor was eliminated from the taint of illegality, fraud

36cap
MONDAY

INSURANCE AND REAL ESTATE

APRIL 12, 1971

Mr. Orio continued: and some of the things spoken against these gentlemen who work hard and do a fine job and should be respected as part of the medical industry and to my knowledge have been the only salvation for several people. And accordingly I feel that the time has come when any discrimination against chiropractors should be eliminated in this bill and in any other bill. Thank you.

Sen. Dinielli: Thank you Mr. Orio. Anyone else in favor?

Dr. Stephen Owens, representing the Connecticut Chiropractors Association and the American Chiropractic Association: I am here to speak in favor of HB-8009. It was our impression that this bill was passed two years ago by the last Assembly. And it got into conflict with a change of the definition of the Medical Service Corporation. As a result we, the initial date or the date that these acts were to take place, were in conflict, a change of definition came first and therefore we were inadvertently knocked out. We believe very strongly in that ethereal concept of the wisdom of the Legislature and we feel that it was very firm in its commitment that this act should be a matter of public record. So we would again ask you in your wisdom to repass this. I think it is just a matter of bookkeeping. It came into conflict with the date and I think that as you are probably aware, Act 582 which was passed by the Legislature permits no discrimination on the part of any insurance company as to a chiropractic claim. The only people who felt that they were insulated from the insurance world and from the insurance law was the CMS or the medical service corporations. So we ask you specifically to amend this and to a pass this.

Our many patients who come in are always shocked to find out that they are not covered under this CMS contract. We tell them that we are sorry that this is one of the areas of discrimination which is not known to them and is withheld from them. I don't think intentionally but they really don't know they are not covered. As a result we constantly write in and they write in to find out they were not covered. Since there is so much insulation in terms of tax advantages and being tax free and this being an act in the best interest of the public we feel that certainly here where the State supports them in so many ways, there should be do discrimination.

We ask again in your wisdom that you repass this bill so that this injustice can be corrected. And I thank you for your time.

Sen. Dinielli: Thank you Dr. Owens, any questions from the committee? Anyone else in favor? I guess not. Opposed?

John Gerardo, representing CMS: This is a statement of CMS. No one discriminates against chiropractors. However the statement shows

37cap
MONDAY

INSURANCE AND REAL ESTATE

APRIL 12, 1971

Mr. Gerardo continued: of CMS that AMA, American Cancer, AF of L CIO, National Council of Senior Citizens, American Public Health Association, HEW Task Force and the Health Insurance Association of American and it goes on for another page have at various times fought inclusion in Medicare on this kind of thing.

Now CMS consistently provides coverage for services whether, where there is a demand or a need and no current or medical and scientific opinion which takes part or places chiropractic under this category. Neither is there any widespread subscriber demand for this type of coverage, or any indication that there is subscriber willingness to pay this additional cost.

Now I have here the AFL-CIO Fact Sheet on Chiropractic. When it opposes inclusion in the Medicare Prgm. There are not our figures, this is what we are picking up all along the line. I also have a number of statements which were printed under the auspices of the AMA, which includes the Department of Health, American Public Health Association etc. I will leave all of this evidence for the consideration of the committee.

Sen. Dinielli: Thank you Mr. Gerardo, Any questions from the committee? Anyone else in opposition?

HB-6912 AN ACT CONCERNING REPRESENTATION OF POLICYHOLDERS ON BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR HOSPITAL SERVICE CORPORATIONS. I guess we have discussed this. This is a similar bill. Mr. Orio, we will accept your comments on the other bill.

Mr. Orio: Yes, for that reason I didn't speak on the other bill. I figure this is a catch all and would probably cover all those things. I can't understand why today of all days, I heard on the radio coming up from New Haven, that the Blue Cross has just raised the rates for individual subscribers to their plan. This is taxation without representation. That argument goes back to 250 years. I can't see why they have anything to hide. Now perhaps its a technical question how to arrive at who would represent the policyholders who, how many of them would represent on the Board of Directors of the Blue Cross. But it would be conceivable that by having policyholders' meetings or some such affairs that they can arrive at candidates interested in serving the policyholders interest in these contracts, which consistently go up without their benefit. And which take it upon themselves to say that they don't want coverage for chiropractic assistance.

I mean who gives them the God given right to take this when you find members of the public having want this help, want this kind

Monday, May 17, 1971

75.

MR. DONNELLY: (46th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill as amended. I have no hesitation whatever, Mr. Speaker, in recommending to the members favorable consideration on the bill as amended. I think it's a wholly, logical and sensible thing to do under the 1968 Firearms Act as has been said by Rep. Carrozzella. I urge its adoption.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. Rep. Dooley.

MR. DOOLEY: (47th)

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in favor of the bill. This bill does no more than what 38 states have already done for their residents in allowing them to go into contiguous states and buy rifles and shotguns. I feel that the loss of sales tax revenue is going to be minimal and I hardly think that's a reason to deny our citizens the rights as provided to them by the Federal Act.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying AYE. Opposed. The bill is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 700, H.B. 8009. AN ACT CONCERNING PAYMENT BY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPORATIONS FOR SERVICES OF CHIROPRACTORS.

THE SPEAKER:

Rep. LaRosa from the 4th.

roc

Monday, May 17, 1971

76.

MR. LAROSA: (4th)

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

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark.

MR. LAROSA: (4th)

Mr. Speaker, the 1967 session passed legislation pertaining to chiropractors who would be reimbursed for services under insurance policies. And at that time it was said on the floor of the House that in all probability it would increase premiums. So since 1967 to today I have numerous letters from different insurance companies throughout the country telling us that there has been no increase in premiums as a result of this additional service. Also in 1969, we passed H.B. 7197 which in essence does the same thing that this bill would do meaning that services would be paid by CMS but through some error we passed another bill which repealed Public Act 342. And all this does, Mr. Speaker, is to correct that error and gives the people of the State of Connecticut the services that they are entitled to under CMS. Through other companies we find that there would be no increase in premiums. I urge its passage.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. If not, all those in favor indicate by saying AYE. Opposed. The bill is PASSED.

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

June 7, 1971

32

THE CLERK:

The first item the Clerk has marked ready is on Page 3. Cal. 976, File 1351 Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Judiciary on Substitute S.B. 895 An Act Concerning the Respective Liability of Municipalities and Abutting Landowners to Persons Injured by Means of Defective Public Sidewalks and Granting to Municipalities the Local Option to Impose the Duty of Care on Abutting Landowners.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Jackson.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President I move acceptance of the joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, this bill will provide under local option the right of municipalities to place the burden for personal injuries and property damage sustained on public sidewalks on the abutting land owner. The rationale behind this would be that the cities would save the cost and expense and also the trouble of getting personnel to defend many law suits which they have to defend at the present time.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

The Clerk skipped a Calendar previously called on page 2. Cal. 825, File 672, Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Insurance and Real Estate H.B. 8009 An Act Concerning Payment by Medical Service Corporations for Services of Chiropractors.

June 7, 1971

33.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Dinielli.

SENATOR DINIELLI:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR DINIELLI:

Mr. President, this bill makes mandatory the inclusion under contracts issued by the Medical Service Corp. such as CMS, Inc. payment for services rendered by properly licensed Chiropractors. Up to the present time such service contracts provided in main for services rendered only to licensed physicians. While in many instances parallel services can be rendered by other practitioners. While not actually medical physicians and their bills would be denied. This modification takes care of this continuing problem as long as the Chiropractor is properly licensed and performing a service within his authority.

I would like to say to the circle and to you Mr. President, that this is a situation that really should not be before. It should be something that CMS should properly cover on the own violation. I think that the facts are before our committee, and myself that there has been many comments from CMS to large purchases of group insurance. That this would cause an increase in group rates. The information that the committee has is that this is not so. There are many cases, for instance in Massachusetts just two years ago, passed this. Have found it unnecessary to increase their rates because of the inclusion of Chiropractors. We have found that in all cases involving Workmen's Compensation that there has been no increase in costs because of the inclusion of Chiropractors. I would suggest that many of the communications we have received from the Connecticut State Medical Society seem to be in opposition to something or other. But in reviewing my files I find that its not necessarily so. I find that they are

June 7, 1971

24.

in favor of funding the tumor registry. But in every other case it seems that they are opposed to something. This maybe a direct result of the fact that the Board of Directors is composed of over half the members of CMS, are members of the medical profession.

I would like to say that the main objection I have to this approach by CMS, is that it is not based on facts. I have copies of letters, and I am sure that every member of the circle here has received this file, from many many insurance companies. Who state over and over again from some of the largest stock companies, mutual companies, every company imaginable throughout the United States that at no time has the inclusion of Chiropractors services caused an increase in rates to the subscribers. I submit that what CMS is doing by calling attention to a potential rate increase is really a scare tactic. It is not based on fact. And if it is based according to their people who check their rates, its because of information submitted by CMS. I don't believe that there is any basis here to what they say.

This is something that was passed two years ago. By this General Assembly. And because of an inclusion of another Statute was made null and void. But this is something thats been before us so many times. I would like to say that if there is opposition to the inclusion of Chiropractors services in any medical contract. The problem is not with the insurance companies. I think it is with the State of Connecticut. Because we do in fact, license Chiropractors. And there are many medical people who perform the same services. Are paid for them and I feel that if we license people to perform these services then they should be paid on the same rate.

And finally Mr. President, if Chiropractors are allowed to be paid if this bill is passed. It would in fact possibly reduce rates. Because in no case do they use hospital services which tend to increase the total rates. They in fact use home and office visits to greater extend than the medical profession does today. So I ask for adoption of this measure. I think its in the public

June 7, 1971

35.

interest. Its certainly well deserved by the Chiropractors.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage of the bill. Will you remark further? Senator Gunther.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

Mr. President, I rise to support this bill and concur 100% with what Senator Dinielli has already stated. About a week or so ago we received a letter here from the State Medical Society. Frankly, I think this was one of the worst piece of lobbying I have ever seen in the State of Connecticut. Since I've been up here anyway. And I won't lend dignity in reputting that in total. But I do think there are some facts that should be brought out to this circle. And I would like to give you a little bit on a Chiropractic fact sheet. Which should clear the air as to some of the remarks that were made in that particular piece of lobby. Connecticut has licensed Chiropractors physicians since 1917. Chiropractic physicians have been included in Workmen's Compensation from its inception in the 1930's. The same statutory requirement as the medical doctor requires in his schooling is required in the Chiropractor physician. Chiropractor must take the same exam as the medical doctor and anatomy, physiology, pathology, diagnosis and public health. This is called the State Homeopathic Board in the State of Connecticut. The Chiropractic physician is paid under Welfare presently. The Chiropractor care is paid for under Medicare. All insurance contracts written in Connecticut pay Chiropractor claims on equal with the M.D. claim. Chiropractor profession is the only profession to impose annual regular educational sessions for all doctors for license in our state. The profession polices its own x-ray equipment and installation long before the State Department of Health starting to monitor them. The Chiropractor physician has insurance renewal committees to handle all disputed cases involving insurance companies. The Chiropractor has never had a rate increase to include Chiropractor care in any insurance contract. The now

June 7, 1971

36.

practiced rates for Chiropractor physician are the same the first policies issued in 1939. While the medical malpractice rates are soaring. Chiropractic physicians do not use drugs for surgery and therefore reduce hospital and drug costs. The Chiropractic physician do not claim to know the entire cause/^{or cure} of all disease. They refer patients for services such as drugs, surgery, psychotherapy and etc. as the need indicates. Knowledagable medical doctors refer patients to Chiropractors physicians when they're needed. The Chiropractic physicians have met all the requirements in responsibilities in licensing in our state. I think that the medical opposition to the Chiropractic profession is a traditional type thing. While there has been no clinical evaluation of the Chiropractor treatment, has ever been made by medicine. The political and emotional outpouring has created much heat and no light. Now in all honesty there is no reason in the world. And we can find no firm cases to deny the services that are rendered by the Chiropractor physician under CMS. And I subscribe to what Senator Dinielli. I think that you'll find out that they even could reduce the rates rather than increase them.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further?
Senator Ciarlone. Senator Power next.

SENATOR CIARLONE:

Mr. President, members of the circle I wish to associate myself with the remarks of Senator Dinielli and Senator Gunther. This bill has unfortunately developed into an emotional and controversial bill. However, I believe that Chiropractor is an area that is presently now licensed to operate in the state of Connecticut as you all know. I personally feel that the medical services corporations should accept the services. Because there are very many people that do benefit from these services at a lower rate. I ask the support of all you gentlemen in the circle.

SENATOR POWER:

Mr. President, I rise to oppose this bill. I have nothing

June 7, 1971

37.

against Chiropractors. I think that they perform a much needed service. I am speaking only in opposition because of the possibility of the 10% increase in the costs of the CMS premiums. There is an old saying that you can do anything you want to with figures. And there seems to be many conflicting figures going about here tonight. That there would be no increase in rates. I happen to believe that there would be. So I am speaking not against the Chiropractors. But their inclusion in these policies. I sincerely hope that I never get a sore back and they have to work on me, because they might hold it against me. But I oppose this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Buckley.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of Senator Power. It seems to me impossible to believe, just impossible if a new service is offered to people who have CMS contracts. And in some cases I understand certain phases of the major medical contract offered by Blue Cross. That there will be an increase in costs. I deny the premise that inclusion of these services within certain contracts and certain other states did not result in an immediate increase. Of course it doesn't. The increase comes when the cost figures of the particular Health Insurance Plan result in the net loss or close to a loss at which time they approach the regulatory authority. In Connecticut the Insurance Commissioner to ask for an increase. So that the inclusion does not mean an immediate increase. It cannot. It has to wait its turn with other profitable activities in order for the whole plan, the total plan to be included in a regulatory application. It seems to me that medical care in the year 1971 is approaching the point, and has approached the point of being almost prohibitive to many people. I do not believe personally that the vast majority of people who are subscribers to CMS and similiar plans will take advantage of the service. But I

June 7, 1971

38.

think that the vast majority of those subscribers on the other side of the coin, will have to pay the costs for those people who choose to take advantage of these services.

I would say that the subscribers to the plans certainly can be well taken care of through the ordinary medical channels that are available under existing legislation. And for these reasons I will oppose the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Diniello.

SENATOR DINIELLI:

Mr. President, members of the circle. Again I rise to point out a few pertinent facts. Which I may have missed earlier. While I understand the opposition that may appear here because of a posed 10% rate increase. As proclaimed by CMS. I think its important that you all hear letters from Bankers Life and Casualty of Chicago, Ill. Who say that they are happy to tell us that Bankers Life and any of its affiliated companies have never charged an extra premium to include coverage for Chiropractor care. Continental Insurance Company, it is not our policy to charge additional premium on Group Coverages under which Chiropractor services are payable. Allstate, as I mentioned to you we do not make a separate charge for premium rate calculated for providing benefits for Chiropractic services covered under our policies. Mutual of Omaha, No additional premium for these contracts have ever been involved in this consideration.

These are companies that have carried this service for many, many years. This is not a new thing with them. Its something that has never effected their rates. I submit that the 10% boogie man scare that has been presented to many of you. Is manufactured by CMS. Based on information submitted to their analysts. I feel that they have been unfair in this approach. And I think that they have manufactured this rate increase. We have millions of people covered under policies that are serviced by Chiropractors. Have never caused a rate increase because of

June 7, 1971

39.

their services. I can't feel that CMS would have to increase their services. And if they did in fact, it might be due to mismanagement on the part of CMS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gunther.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

Mr. President, if I might add one more reference that Senator Dinielli did not make. Which is the state of Connecticut Workmen's Compensation Commission by its Chairman Mr. Wm. Fox, on May 18, said that I know of no premium increase in any contract due to the inclusion of Chiropractors care. Right under our compensation laws of the state of Connecticut. I know, and of course many times people confuse me with the Chiropractor physician. I am in the same church but a little different pew. And I can speak from experience. I think that your going to find out that what we're looking for here mostly is the inclusion of the x-rays fees that would be charged. And I can tell you in my own profession, before I got into the Senate, I do have x-ray equipment and I did take x-rays. And many times I will refer my patient into a rankonology lab. Thats going to charge a higher fee than I would have charged for that same x-ray. But had I been included and I am not asking that. I'm asking this for the Chiropractors profession itself. There would be no greater charge in fact there would be a lesser charge. For the x-rays. Nine out of ten times. So that I don't know how their actuary came up with the figures. And I must subscribe to the remarks that were made by Senator Dinielli. I think this is purely inappropriate by CMS. And I don't think this is going to cost any increase in costs to the psycscribers of CMS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Buckley.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

I yield to Senator Dowd.

June 7, 1971

40.

SENATOR DOWD:

Mr. President, Thank you Senator Buckley. Mr. President to me the question is not whether this will cost 10% or 2% or 50%. To me, Mr. PRESIDENT, the question is not whether a Chiropractor is licensed under strict and similar procedures as our physicians or not. The question to me is why are we being called upon to do this? Are we being called upon to legislate this because CMS has found that its market of subscribers have demanded this kind of extension of service? From the debate I've heard tonight, Sir, I don't think that's the case. And in the absence of any market demand for this. I am simply not persuaded as to why we should pass this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Ciarlone.

SENATOR CIARLONE:

Mr. President, members of the circle. I think Senator Gunther hit the nail on the head when he said that he can perhaps take x-rays for a fee less than the medical profession. And I think that the big thrust to this bill, in my mind is, there are many people in our society today that perhaps are availing themselves of medical service because of the cost in the industry. And I think that the same cost that could be performed by the Chiropractor industry, they would perhaps avail themselves because of the lower costs. And I certainly support this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Buckley.

SENATOR BUCKLEY:

Mr. President, I agree totally with the remarks of Senator Dinielli concerning the insurance companies. But I point out to Senator Dinielli that the reason that there is no increase in the plans of Mutual of Omaha and the other companies he mentioned is simply because Chiropractors services are included within the costs of the plan. In the beginning. So therefore you don't have to increase it. And I point out to Senator Gunther that under

June 7, 1971

41.

Workmen's compensation the Chiropractor services are included within that area of our laws in the state of Connecticut. So therefore you wouldn't expect any increase. So what bearing do these letters have upon the discussion tonight? I respectfully suggest that if you believe there is going to be an increase you will not be persuaded by these statements which are contained in these letters and the statements of these high minded and I'm sure very idealistic Senators.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Dinielli.

SENATOR DINIELLI:

Mr. President for the third time, and since its before 11 o'clock, to Senator Crafts,

THE CHAIR:

Just say that your getting up to explain anyway.

SENATOR DINIELLI:

Thank you Senator and Mr. President. I would like to point out in reference to the Honorable and Esteemed Senator Buckley, who has been my guiding light up here for many terms. That only two years ago, we mandated this service in all contracts written in Connecticut. On all other plans other than the CMS plan. And there has been no need for an increase. I think this speaks for itself. There has been no need for an increase. Its been in effect since October of 1969. And the companies in Connecticut, who are now riding policy have found that it has not been necessary to increase. This is recent.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Power.

SENATOR POWER:

Mr. President, I would like to point out that the, I am sure that if these rates do increase as I would imagine they would by 10%. It would not be by mismanagement. As my good friend Senator Dinielli suggested. The actual study was conducted by a very competent auditing firm. In fact they were the firm that use to

June 7, 1971

42.

audit the books of the City of Torrington when I was Mayor. I have complete faith in them. And they conducted an actuarial study and came up with the thought that this would increase the premium rates by 10%. So I'm sure that their figure is pretty well founded.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Cutillo.

SENATOR CUTILLO:

Mr. President, I must rise in support of this bill. I rise not so much to support or reject to whether we're going to have a premium increase with the insurance companies. Rather from personal experiences. And I hope I'm not in conflict of interest as I relate this. But I had an experience several years ago. Where I was injured and had to spend quite a bit of time at a doctor's office. And I should say reputable doctor in the city of Waterbury. To make a long story short at this late hour, Mr. President. They did not alleviate my pain. A Chiropractor did. And I believe that they do have the function, to answer Senator Dowd's point. That he sees no need. Well if you haven't had the occasion to use a Chiropractor, I can appreciate that. But if an individual who has had this need, and has used a Chiropractor and appreciates what a Chiropractor can do for him or her. You would then Senator see the need for this particular legislation. There are people in this State, I am sure who can use the advantages that a Chiropractor can give them to the best of their health. And I urge the passage of this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator DuPont.

SENATOR DUPONT:

Mr. President, I didn't intend to speak on this particular bill. But frankly I've become tired of sitting here listening as to whether or not this is going to increase the rate or not. And I paid particular heed to Senator Dinielli's remarks that more than half of the Board of Directors of CMS are composed of the

June 7 1971

43

medical profession. It seems to me that this is a question that has arisen, or brought to this debate because of the medical profession. If a particular person wants to use a Chiropractor and I am sure that many citizens of the State of Connecticut do. It would seem to me that this should be covered under CMS. And they should have this opportunity of choosing the type of doctor that they wish. And we shouldn't be governed by the medical profession. And if there are so many members of the medical profession on the Connecticut Medical Services Board, I think its time that they gave somebody else an opportunity. And let the public operate this corporation for the benefit of the public as it should be. And not take up our time here, hour after hour discussing this.

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? nay. The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk has on his desk now a bill previously it was moved for reconsideration. Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Transportation on Substitute H.B. 7841 An Act Concerning the Use and Operation of Snowmobiles.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Mondani.

SENATOR MONDANI:

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

THE CHAIR:

The Clerk has an amendment.

SENATOR MONDANI:

The Clerk has an amendment. I move adoption of the amendment. We can waive the reading.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.