

HB 8225

PA 795

1971

senate -

3406

house -

5417 - 5419

public health

\$

-

695, 701, 724 - 729

safety

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

June 9, 1971

Page 77

File numbers and I'll move for suspension for immediate consideration.

They should be in the Clerk's possession and we'll file this list too, if he wishes.

THE CHAIR:

That's what we're talking about, Senator. We want to compare the bills themselves, against the list we have.

Would you come up, Senator Ives and we'll expediate this very quickly?

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, I move for suspension of the rules for immediate consideration of the following bills:

THE CHAIR:

If there is no objection it is so ordered.

SENATOR IVES:

Mr. President, House Bill 5109, File 1268; House Bill 5298, File 1699; House Bill 5433, File 1310; House Bill 5730, File 940; House Bill 5781, File 1196; House Bill 5782, File 1211; House Bill 6277, File 289; House Bill 6411, File 1117; House Bill 6448, File 1377; House Bill 6685, File 1461; House Bill 6716, File 1684; House Bill 6927, File 934; House Bill 7170, File 769; House Bill 7811, File 1104; House Bill 8410, File 1106; House Bill 8225, File 1197; House Bill 8796, File 927; House Bill 8835, File 1305; House Bill 9189, File 1453; House Bill 6928, File 1080; House Bill 8485, File 1642.

Mr. President, I move for the adoption of the bills listed.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection to the adoption or passage of the bills? Hearing none; said bills declared passed.

H-119

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 12
5163-5554**

Monday, June 7, 1971

81.

were required, where would they come from if they were not additional funds.

MR. METTLER: (96th)

I think I missed that, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask for it again.

MR. COLLINS: (165th)

Mr. Speaker, through you, where would the funds come from if additional funds were required.

MR. METTLER: (96th)

The funds for this program come from the money allotted to the Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources. A certain amount of money is assigned in the Governor's budget for this purpose. I don't think it is a question, Mr. Speaker, of additional monies necessarily being involved in the total. It's a question of clearing up the discrepancy in the law as it presently exists.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. If not, question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. All those in favor will indicate by saying AYE. Opposed. The BILL IS PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 533, Sub. for H.B. 8225. AN ACT CONCERNING STATE ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH FACILITIES.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The lady from the 17th.

roc

Monday, June 7, 1971

82.

MRS. YACAVONE: (17th)

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark.

MRS. YACAVONE: (17th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. A community mental health facility may apply for a grant from the State Department of Mental Health for up to two-thirds of their operating expenses. Prescribed in the makeup of the mental health facility are psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and para-professionals to be included on the staff. A town of over 40,000 or a combination of towns totaling 40,000 or a district department of health may apply for such assistance. The effectiveness of the services particularly the services made available for children under 16 will be carefully evaluated in making such grants. I urge passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill. The gentleman from the 113th.

MR. WEBBER: (113th)

Very briefly, I, too, support the bill and do sincerely hope every member in this Assembly will vote for the measure. It is a very important measure. Unfortunately, the problem of mental health is a growing problem, particularly with youngsters. Our facilities, our programs are pitifully inadequate. Please

roc

Monday, June 7, 1971

83.

support this bill, if you will.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. The gentleman from the 165th.

MR. COLLINS: (165th)

Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment, possibly a question to the gracious lady reporting out the bill. In the very last line, it indicates that grants made under this act are to be made on a biennial basis. I wonder if it was not the intent to have them made on an annual basis now that we are on annual sessions.

MRS. YACAVONE: (17th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I just noticed that and I was thinking perhaps next year we could take care of that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. The gentleman from the 147th.

MR. FABRIZIO: (147th)

Mr. Speaker, I also support this bill. The more we can do for mental health the better off we are. And this money spent to the localities saves money to the State in the long run because then these people don't have to go to State hospitals. They are treated as outpatients.

DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further. If not, question is on acceptance and passage. All those in favor will indicate by saying AYE.

Opposed. THE BILL IS PASSED.

roc

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC
HEALTH
AND
SAFETY**

**PART 2
492-901**

1971

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

MARCH 30, 1971

Sen. Rome: Yes, Dr. Cohen, I absolutely do. I don't think there's any urgency to act on this today. But I think it would be a difficult thing to anticipate that we would act upon this in '72 or '73 when the other hospitals have available beds, and the University hospital in Farmington is open. I think then we'd be acting in a crisis situation and I think that's deplorable and ought to be avoided if we could.

Rep. Cohen: Thank you very much, Senator Rome.

Sen. Rome: Thank you.

Rep. Cohen: Rep. Chagnon.

Rep. John Chagnon, 97th Assembly District: Appearing in favor of House Bill 8225 (AN ACT CONCERNING STATE ASSISTANCE TO COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH FACILITIES). The details as to why this legislation is being introduced are included in the presentation which I will leave with your secretary. If there is any further details you'll need in executive committee, I will be glad to have the people here to appear before you. Thank you so much.

Rep. Cohen: Thank you for your brevity. Rep. Truex.

Rep. Ruth Truex, 23rd District in Wethersfield: I'm not sure that I can beat Rep. Chagnon in his brevity, but I will try, believe me. I am here in support of House Bill 5889 (AN ACT CONCERNING REIMBURSEMENT OF HOSPITALS AND REST HOMES). The act is merely an attempt to provide a fairer method of reimbursement for hospitals and rest homes, and incorporates the non-profit, chronic and convalescent hospitals and rest homes with nursing supervision in the general formula for the re-payment of hospitals, and would base the payment on the actual cost for services rendered rather than the formula as presently indicated in the statutes. It would make a fairer basis for payment for the hospitals and rest homes and make it possible I think for them to provide better care particularly for the elderly. And we all are of course in sympathy with any of these methods as far as aiding the elderly are concerned. And mean that the State would pay its full share of the cost of such patients in these institutions. I think it's a good bill. I have worked closely with one of the non-profit convalescent homes in the area and I know what a problem it is to meet the budget. And I would be very happy if you would give it your favorable consideration or careful consideration. There are many people who will speak here on it in detail, and I'm sure they can answer questions which you have. Thank you.

Rep. Cohen: Thank you very much. Are there any more Senators or Representatives? If not we'll call on Deputy Commissioner Morreson.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

MARCH 30, 1971

Rep. Cohen: I don't think we have any control over the (not clear).
They're doing what they want.

Dr. Czarsty: Right. But I think of course those who pay the bill call
the tune.

Rep. Cohen: They should.

Dr. Czarsty: Well, you pass the bill, I think we will.

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

Dr. Czarsty: O.K.

Rep. Cohen: Did you want to add to this? Rep. Webber.

Rep. Webber from New Haven: Thank you very much, Dr. Cohen. I appreciate
your permitting me to come in for just a half a moment
and I notice you have a large group.

Rep. Cohen: Legislators up to ten o'clock so you have -

Rep. Webber: Yeah, well, I appreciate that. I just want the record to
note that I am strongly in favor of House Bill 6773 (AN ACT
CONCERNING MEDICAL PARAPROFESSIONALS) although I'm only
holding a statement of purpose, I would like very much to
see the entire bill. But the, the concept of, is a good one
and I think it's long overdue. I don't know whether or not
I would buy that section of the bill that refers to licensing
the paraprofessionals, but I certainly would support any kind
of a measure that would expand a training program for para-
professionals which are so sorely needed in all of our hos-
pitals and all of our medical facilities and could relieve
certainly the overtaxed burdens of, of the professionals per
se.

I also want the record to note that I am strongly in favor of
House Bill 8225, an act concerning state assistance to
community mental health facilities. As a matter of fact, I
would support with all the vigor at my command, any kind of
a measure, any kind of a proposal that would help the, the
emotionally and mentally disturbed, because I, I stay here
and hang my head in shame as a member of the Legislature and
as a member of the, of the society in the State of Connecti-
cut. We think about the pitifully inadequate, just poor
facilities. Thank you very much. I don't know how poor
they are. We just don't have enough of them to properly treat
the emotionally disturbed, particularly in the area of children.
And so, Mr. Chairman, again thank you for permitting me to
appear before your Committee, and I do hope that my comments
will be noted by your Committee and you will act favorably
on both of these measures. Thank you very much.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

MARCH 30, 1971

Dr. Zazzaro: Well, you are correct but not in relation to what I am talking about, for this reason. You cannot give a person material to say make a denture. There must be instructions to go along with this. And I'm sure you would expect a dentist or someone who's trained to do this, to relate these instructions to the individual. And I think that's the crux here. It is the instructions that are given along with this that I feel fall under the definition, or should fall under the definition of what constitutes the practice. In other words, if a, if an individual is going to get instructions on how to do dentistry, whether they do it on themselves or not, they should at least get the proper instructions. And those instructions must fall under the category of the education and the experience of a dentist. And no one else. It shouldn't come from a medical man. It shouldn't come from a lay person. I'm sure that that philosophy would hold in your instance.

Rep. Cohen: Any other questions of the doctor? Dr. Zazzaro, while you're here. At a previous hearing on bill 6128, we had a hearing as you'll recall, and I made the suggestion, we're going to act on this bill one way or the other, whether you would accept as part of that bill that in your bill you asked for the Dental Commission to control the research. And I asked if you would allow others to be on this Commission. For instance, I had the suggestion that three members of the Commission and two lay members, one appointed by the Speaker of the House, one appointed by the President Pro Tem of the Senate. Would that meet with your approval in this bill?

Dr. Zazzaro: Yes, yes, it would. Yes it would.

Rep. Cohen: Thank you very much.

Dr. Zazzaro: Thank you.

Rep. Cohen: Mr. Prosser I think is - go right ahead. Just identify yourself.

Daniel Prosser, Associate Commissioner for the Division of Community Services of the State Department of Mental Health: I would like to speak specifically and make a few comments relative to H.B. 8225, an act concerning state assistance to community mental health facilities.

This bill, I would give a brief history of its origins, originated when the town of Hamden applied under the existing laws governing community psychiatric clinics for children. And one of the provisions in the existing law, I think it's cited down on line 23, the Director of Health of any district Department of Health, or any full time Director of Health may apply. The question was raised by the Attorney General's office that the Director of Health basically is a creature of town government. So we felt, our Attorney General felt

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

MARCH 30, 1971

that there was some ambiguity in the existing law. Actually no health department prior to the application from Hamden had applied so this facet of the existing law was never really tested in these terms. So the Senator, Representative Chagnon introduced this bill to, for one thing, to correct this ambiguity. And we as a Department of Mental Health support this correction, or this amendment to the existing act.

There is one feature of the bill that you have before you that we would suggest not be deleted that was in the original mental health, or psychiatric clinic for children, or adults, and it says, Said Department, I'm looking at line, starting on line 40, of the bill, "said department shall base any such grant of funds on the amount" and what has been taken out is "of service provided to children the age of sixteen". This does not necessarily limit those services to children under sixteen, but this shall be a consideration when grants are, are allocated based on whatever is appropriated to this funding mechanism for the support of voluntary non-profit or town enterprises providing services for children in their community. And I see really no basic concern with this. As far as the Department is concerned, it doesn't change in any way those programs that have developed over the years since 1955. It does broaden the base. For, it, for instance, the original law required that the director of such a service should be a psychiatrist. This provides for the employment of a psychiatrist but in many instances we find that there are other professional disciplines within the mental health field as psychologists, social workers, psychiatrists, who can in effect provide the administrative over view of the development of such a service. And we feel that this would possibly enhance the capability of many communities to design a service where they wouldn't be able to get the psychiatrist-director which should invest the time. We of the Department would certainly insist that there be psychiatric personnel on the staff to assume responsibility, medical responsibility for those children that are receiving and in need of specific psychiatric therapy.

I think that we as a Department would support this bill although we as a Department did not introduce it, or suggest its introduction. And we feel it's a sound approach to the development of service delivery systems for children in the State of Connecticut.

Rep. Cohen: Any questions of the speaker? Thank you very much.

Atty. Steven Humphrey: I represent the Tobacco Institute and I'm speaking in opposition to H.B. 8561 (AN ACT PROHIBITING CIGARETTE VENDING MACHINES IN HOSPITALS). Two quick comments. One, I would say let the hospitals decide individually whether or not they want to allow cigarette machines or vending machines

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

MARCH 30, 1971

in hospitals. And second of all, if you're going to just prohibit it in a public place, what you're saying is that the doctors and nurses in their own rooms can have a vending, a vending machine, but you're not going to have it for the public. And I don't think that, I don't think this is legislation which is needed. The hospitals are going to act on their own and want to prohibit it, let, let the hospitals do it, and leave it to them. Thank you.

Rep. Cohen: Any questions of the speaker? Thank you very much. Gail Chandler.

Gail Chandler, Administrator of the Hamden Mental Health Service: I'm a psychologist. I'm speaking in connection with bill 8225 which Mr. Prosser just addressed himself to. I'm speaking from the same point of view as Mr. Prosser.

The bill before you is supported in the strongest way by the Hamden Mental Health Commission, the body appointed by the Mayor of Hamden in February, 1970, and charged with establishing a mental health service in Hamden supported by Hamden taxes and providing mental health services to children and youth of Hamden. I might point out the Hamden Mental Health Service established by that Commission and put into operation September of last year, is the only municipally funded mental health clinic in the State of Connecticut. Our legislative council has underwritten the entire budget for this service but we also applied for assistance under section 17-225 which the bill before you amends.

Our interest in the present legislation stems from a desire to see our own clinic prosper and to encourage other like-minded communities to develop and enlarge mental health services for children in a manner similar to the way we have in Hamden.

As a municipal service, we desire to be enabled to apply for funds from the State Department of Mental Health directly, and not through a "director of health", as the present statute would have us. Our reason is simple. In Hamden the Mental Health Service is constituted as a separate department of the town government, not as a division of the health department. We believe that the towns ought to have the right to provide mental health service in this fashion if they so desire. The present bill will accomplish this, while specifying at the same time that communities ought to be large enough to employ a director of health - that is, at least 40,000 in population - before attempting to establish an independent mental health service.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

MARCH 30, 1971

A second specific change sought after by the Hamden Mental Health Commission has to do with the direction of the clinic. It is our understanding that as a matter of practice a number of child guidance clinics in this state do not employ a psychiatrist as executive director. The reasons are simple. Given the salary a psychiatrist can command, to require that every clinic employ a psychiatrist as its director places a very considerable financial burden on the clinic. And in any event, psychiatrists prefer to use their time, and are best equipped to use their time, in patient treatment, not managerial functions. This reasoning has led to the introduction of legislation elsewhere that would no longer require that hospitals and other installations of the Connecticut Department of Mental Health be administered by a psychiatrist. The bill before you will remove this unnecessary restriction from local mental health clinics.

It is our understanding that the psychiatric community as a whole favors a provision such as this. It should be pointed out, at the same time, that, wherever feasible, psychiatric time should be available to clinics and clinics should regularly employ a psychiatrist as a staff member. Our concern is simply that the growth of mental health services not be impeded by the inappropriate and wasteful use of medical personnel.

One correction to the bill should be made. In lines 49 and 50 the phrase "of service provided to children under sixteen years of age" has been deleted. We now believe this to be in error, since it is important that children's mental health services be separately identified. We would suggest that this phrase be reinstated.

The other provisions of the bill relate in a broader way to modern concepts of community mental health. That is, they provide more encouragement for innovation while also stressing the need for careful evaluation.

One final comment. There is nothing in this bill that would require any child guidance clinic to operate differently from the way it does now. What the bill does is to encourage communities such as Hamden to continue to develop local clinics that will most effectively serve local needs.

The Hamden Mental Health Commission has unanimously supported this bill. I commend it to you. Favorable consideration is important to the growth of local, and locally funded, mental health services in our communities.

Rep. Cohen: Any questions of the speaker? Will you leave a copy of that with us? Thank you very much. Stephen Dworkin, Rosalyn Fishman and Richard - bill 6123. You're from the same organization I take it. Are you going to have one spokesman or?

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

MARCH 30, 1971

Stephen Dworkin, Mental Health Planner for the South Central Conn. Regional Mental Health Planning Council: I'm here today representing the Legislative Task Force of the fourteen Regional Mental Health Planning Councils which are citizen-based voluntary organizations constituted under Connecticut's Public Act 716 to study, coordinate and plan for the development of comprehensive community-based mental health services for all the people of Connecticut.

The Legislative Task Force of the fourteen Mental Health Councils asked me to appear here today to urge that you support legislation, H.B. 6123, to provide State funds to supplement Federal and local funds for area-wide Comprehensive Health Planning.

Mental health programs developed in isolation from the rest of the health care system denies the fact that people have both emotional as well as physical needs which must be met in order to maintain a decent level of well-being. In planning and coordinating mental health services throughout the State of Connecticut, the fourteen Mental Health Councils need to work hand in hand with comprehensive health planning agencies to assure every person in Connecticut adequate health care services.

Adequate State support to comprehensive health planning will enable the Mental Health Councils and the Comprehensive Health Planning Agencies to eliminate unnecessary fragmentation and ensure the most efficient coordination of all health services and more efficient use of the taxpayer's money.

If I am, unless there are questions on this, I'd like to comment on a previous bill also that has been spoken about. I wanted to just briefly comment on H.B. 8225 that both Mr. Prosser and Dr. Chandler commented on concerning state assistance to community mental health facilities, and one aspect of it which is that, speaking as an individual, that I think that it would be, that I would strongly support and urge that the part of that bill that would amend and remove the restriction presently requiring a psychiatrist to direct child guidance clinics would allow for local citizen participation through the local municipalities. One because of the cost that it takes to hire a psychiatrist, and secondly for the reason that Dr. Chandler was outlining, that psychiatrists for the most part in many instances can be better used utilizing their skills in providing direct treatment for people. I just must say incidentally that the Mental Health Council in the South Central Region supported very strongly the development of the Hamden Mental Health Commission. And for that reason I'm sure that my Council would be very supportive of removing this restriction. It would make more flexible the development of locally based mental health

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

TUESDAY

MARCH 30, 1971

facilities not restricting them to psychiatrists, but also allowing for other mental health personnel to be directors of such facilities. Thank you very much.

Rep. Cohen: Any questions of the speaker? Thank you. Now there were two other people on that same bill that, perhaps that way -

Richard Graves: I think Mrs. Fishman is going to speak on two other bills. I'm addressing myself to 6123. My name is Richard Grave and I'm a cigar manufacturer in New Haven, Connecticut. and I'm speaking on behalf of bill 6123.

My capacity with Comprehensive Health Planning is that I am Chairman of the South Central Comprehensive Health Planning Agency which is a B agency and one of two existing agencies in the state of Connecticut. The problems of high medical costs and inadequate care of environmental pollution are growing more critical every day. We believe that these problems create threatening conditions which require a comprehensive approach with all concerned, those who are in need, the consumer, and those who provide. For the first time such a mechanism for working on these problems exists, and that's comprehensive health planning.

We are only, we have only been operational since June. We are doing basic studies to found, find out what are the priority needs, what is the public health structure we should have, what health care facilities we need, and where, to ensure equal access to health for all. We are paying special attention to those who have greatest needs: the young, the elderly, the poor. Our goal is to improve and maintain health in a healthy environment.

This will not be an easy job and it will not happen quickly. But if the state does not enter into the partnership, it will not happen at all. We think it must be done. We can no longer afford to spend such large sums for incomplete and fragmented care; to support unnecessary duplication in some places and total absence in other places.

We can no longer afford to keep on producing more environmental hazards. We are starting, consumers and providers working together, to do something about it.

Now we need state support, financial support. We are asking you to report favorably on aid to Comprehensive Health Planning Agencies, and to provide at least enough funds for the next year to carry us. The maximum cost to the state if there were ten agencies, which is projected, is \$200,000. At present there are only two operational out of those ten. We believe Connecticut in the long run will gain by this type of planning with provider and consumer.