

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB 1162	PA 213	1997
Senate - 1253, 2145-2156, 2473, 3548-3550		(17)
HOUSE: 3112, 3517, 5222-5257		(38)
Pub. HHR: 1082-1085, 1331-1333		(7)
	Total -	62p.

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2014

S-406

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1997

VOL. 40

PART 4

1083-1433

SB544, is marked Go.

Calendar 282, File 451, Substitute for SB628, I
move referral to the Committee on Insurance.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SEN. JEPSEN:

Calendar 283, File 452, Substitute for SB637, I
move referral to the Committee on Human Services.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SEN. JEPSEN:

Calendar 284, File 453, Substitute for SB851, I
move referral to the Committee on Human Services.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SEN. JEPSEN:

Calendar 285, File 455, Substitute for SB1162, I
move referral to the Committee on Government,
Administration and Elections.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SEN. JEPSEN:

Calendar 286, is PR.

Calendar 287, is PR.

288, is PR.

S-408

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1997

VOL. 40
PART 6
1796-2164

to the Consent Calendar, if there's no objection.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is to refer this item to the Consent Calendar. Without objection, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

Calendar Page 33, Calendar 285, File 455,
Substitute for SB1162, AN ACT CONCERNING LICENSURE OF
MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPISTS, SANITARIANS, SPEECH
PATHOLOGISTS, PODIATRISTS, OPTICIANS, ACUPUNCTURISTS,
CLINICAL SOCIAL WORKERS, MASSAGE THERAPISTS,
VETERINARIANS, RETIRED HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS AND
PARAMEDICS. Favorable Report of the Committee on
Public Health, and Government Administration and
Elections. Clerk is in possession of four Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harp.

SEN. HARP:

Thank you Madam President. I move acceptance of
the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of
the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark?

SEN. HARP:

Yes, Madam President. There is an Amendment, LCO
9111.

THE CLERK:

LCO 9111, which will be designated Senate
Amendment Schedule A. It's offered by Senator Harp of
the 10th District.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harp.

SEN. HARP:

Thank you Madam President. This Amendment makes minor changes to sections of the original bill pertaining to licensure of marriage and family therapists, radiographers, clinical social workers, and massage therapists.

It also deletes sections of the bill regarding confidentiality procedures for complaints against veterinarians, the establishment of a volunteer retired medical professional licensure category, establishment of a licensure program for paramedics.

And the Amendment changes the continuing education criteria for licensed opticians. It also allows the Commissioner of Public Health to designate an agent to operate in his absence.

And finally, the Amendment increases from two to six, the number of physician assistants which may be supervised by a physician at one time. I urge passage of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on adoption. Will you remark?

Senator Bozek.

SEN. BOZEK:

Madam President, I have a question to the proponent of LCO 9111.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SEN. BOZEK:

And that is with regard to lines 77 through 82. On page three. In there is a reference to physician assistant practicing. And my question is, is this Amendment allow the physician assistants to be, to have their own business and be separate from their supervision of medical doctors as they are now?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harp.

SEN. HARP:

Through you Madam President. No it does not. There is permissive language in this section, but that refers to a physician. It does not require a physician to supervise physician assistants, but a physician may supervise physician assistants, but they must be supervised.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bozek.

SEN. BOZEK:

Madam President, Madam President, through you. So what you're saying is, a physician may, so he may not supervise the physician assistant, is that correct?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harp.

SEN. HARP:

If they are not supervised by a physician, they cannot practice.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bozek.

SEN. BOZEK:

Let me ask through you Madam President. Is this, is this bill, is this Amendment the bill earlier which was to allow physician assistants to operate, not operate, but to practice on their own, put into, trying to be put into this particular bill?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harp.

SEN. HARP:

Madam President, I believe that, that the question refers to another bill that has to do with another category of licensure. And so, this bill never intended independent practice. It only intended to

extend the number of physician assistants that a physician could supervise from two to six.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bozek.

SEN. BOZEK:

Alright. This allow, this alright. Can I, I'm missing, would you. I missed something on the, through you Madam President. I missed something on the extent of the Amendment in reference to the summary of the bill. Could you just explain again what the extent of the Amendment does in comparison to what the bill is trying to accomplish.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harp.

SEN. HARP:

Basically this Amendment makes minor changes to the original bill that pertained to, and it tightens the language for grandfathering of marriage and family therapists, radiographers, clinical social workers. It adds the section on physician assistants, which extends to physicians the opportunity to supervise up to six physician assistants.

And I think that if you look in line 71, it says a physician may function as a supervising physician for a physician assistants concurrently. Then it, down in

line 79, it makes very clear that the supervision is active and direct. The other things that the bill does is remove from the bill those things which would require a fiscal note so that the licensure issues that need to be dealt with in this session, can be dealt with because of the time in which we are facing.

We have three weeks left. So those items, although they are important items, were stripped from the bill so that the bill could proceed, and the licensure corrections and updates could occur.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bozek.

SEN. BOZEK:

Thank you Madam President. Thank you Senator.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you sir. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Gunther.

SEN. GUNTHER:

Madam President, I'm a little disappointed in the inclusion of this Amendment to take the veterinarians out of the confidentiality law of the state. If it wasn't the lateness of the hour and that, I would take and make a move to try delete that in a subsequent Amendment. But maybe it will be done down in the House.

I think that the MD's have this protection. I think the veterinarians have a right to the same protection of confidentiality. I don't know if you really understand what we're talking about, but medical doctors and that are covered up until the time that the decision is made on a case, and it isn't put out, it isn't general public knowledge as to the circumstances and the complaints and that.

We had one veterinarian in the State of Connecticut that really took a heck of a beating because of a lack of confidentiality. The newspapers got a hold of it...

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gunther, just a moment please.

SEN. GUNTHER:

A very typical, on what we all, the type of treatment we get with sensationalistic journalism, that they really did an injustice to this man who wasn't guilty of anything. But certainly by the time they got through with him, he was in one heck of a mess.

So, I know there's no way of me stripping this out at this time. But maybe we can look forward to the House maybe putting it back in there. But I do think they deserve the same protection of the confidentiality as any other doctor.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you sir. Will you remark further on Senate Amendment A? Will you remark further? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor indicate by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye

THE CHAIR:

Opposed, nay. Aye's have it. Senate A is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further? If not, would the Clerk please announce a roll call vote. Senator Harp.

SEN. HARP:

There is another Amendment, and it is LCO 4695.

THE CLERK:

LCO 4695, which will be designated Senate Amendment Schedule B. It's offered by Senator Harp of the 10th District.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Harp.

SEN. HARP:

I move the Amendment and then ask, and yield to Senator Gunther.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on adoption of Senate Amendment B.

Senator Gunther do you accept the yield?

SEN. GUNTHER:

THE CHAIR:

Yes, thank you Madam President. This is very brief. This is one of those simple little Amendments that opens the window that allows some acupuncturists to be able to take and qualify under the state. When we passed the original acupuncturist act, we were pretty strict and pretty tight on that.

And because of the strictness in the existing language, there are some very competent people who had practiced for many years. In fact, one of the main purposes of getting this Amendment in here is that we even have this man who was a doctor in China, who has spent years over there.

Was a very competent man in his own right. But couldn't be licensed as an acupuncturist in this state. What it does really, it makes certain that they have the pre-natal course. That's on the proper handling of the needles used in acupuncture.

And it requires them to pass the National Commission for the Certification of Acupuncturists, and written examination by test or by credential review. Secondly, to successfully complete the practical

examination of point location skills offered by the National Commission for the Certification of Acupuncturists. I think it's a good Amendment, and hope it passes.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you sir. Will you remark further on Senate Amendment B? Senator Harp.

SEN. HARP:

Thank you. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of Senator Gunther. I do believe this is a good bill. And in passing the bill last year we left out some people that I think basically brought the acupuncturist skill to America, and we want to correct that mistake.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Senator Harp. Will you remark further on Senate Amendment B? Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor indicate by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye

THE CHAIR:

Opposed, nay. Aye's have it, Senate B is adopted.
Will you remark further on the bill as amended?
Senator Harp.

SEN. HARP:

Yes, thank you Madam President. Basically this is a bill which grandfathers, and makes technical changes to a number of our licensure provisions in our statutes for marriage and family therapy, for sanitarians, for radiographers.

In Section 6, we allow support personnel to assist licensed speech pathologists with certain tasks. In Section 7, we allow podiatrists to provide amputations to certain parts of a foot. And then we allow as well opticians to acquire continuing education units. I urge your passage, I urge you to pass this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Senator Harp. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further? If not, would the Clerk please announce a roll call vote, the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked. Clerk please take a

tally.

THE CLERK:

Motion is on passage of SB1162 as amended.

Total Number Voting	35
Those Voting Yea	35
Those Voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

The bill as amended is passed. At this time would the Clerk please call the Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

Madam President, the second Consent Calendar begins on Calendar Page 4, Calendar 228, HB6764.

Calendar Page 6, Calendar 286, HB6213.

Calendar Page 16, Calendar 423, SB567.

Calendar Page 28, Calendar 184, Substitute for SB1026.

Calendar 193, Substitute for SB1229.

Calendar Page 29, Calendar 199, Substitute for SB894.

Calendar Page 31, Calendar 259, SB998.

Calendar Page 33, Calendar 307, Substitute for SB1075.

Madam President, that completes the second Consent Calendar.

S-412

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1997

VOL. 40
PART 10
3192-3550

Motion is to refer this item to the Consent
Calendar. Without objection, so ordered.

SEN. JEPSEN:

Calendar 285, I move suspension so that it may be
taken up at this time.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is for suspension of the rules in order to
take this up, for marking?

SEN. JEPSEN:

Yes.

THE CHAIR:

For marking. Without objection, so ordered.

SEN. JEPSEN:

At this time I would move Substitute for SB1162,
which is the same Calendar 285, to the Consent
Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is to refer this item to the Consent
Calendar. Without objection, so ordered.

SEN. JEPSEN:

Calendar 307 is PT.

Calendar 315, Substitute for SB995, I move to the
Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is to refer this item to the Consent

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

Madam President, the first Consent Calendar begins on Calendar Page 5, Calendar 536, Substitute for HB6333.

Calendar Page 7, Calendar 567, HB6670.

Calendar Page 8, Calendar 571, HB6916.

Calendar 572, Substitute for HB6771.

Calendar Page 9, Calendar 576, Substitute for HB5723.

Calendar Page 11, Calendar 584, Substitute for HB6854.

Calendar Page 12, Calendar 216, Substitute for SB171.

Calendar Page 18, Calendar 480, Substitute for HB6893.

Calendar 526, HB6338.

Calendar Page 19, Calendar 253, Substitute for SB1211.

Calendar Page 20, Calendar 266, Substitute for SB906.

Calendar 285, Substitute for SB1162.

Calendar 315, Substitute for SB995.

Calendar Page 21, Calendar 327, Substitute for SB260.

Calendar 363, HB6585.

Calendar 375, Substitute for SB1186.

Calendar Page 22, Calendar 490, Substitute for HB6253.

Calendar 525, Substitute for HB6211.

Calendar Page 23, Calendar 369.

Committee on Conference, Substitute for HB5042.

Madam President, I believe that completes the first Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Mr. Clerk. Would you once again announce a roll call vote, the machine will be open for purposes of voting on the Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? If all members have voted, machine will be locked. Clerk please take a

tally.

THE CLERK:

Motion is adoption of the Consent Calendar No. 1.

Total Number Voting 36

Those Voting Yea 36

Those Voting Nay 0

Those absent and not voting 0

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar is adopted. Senator Jepsen.

SEN. JEPSEN:

Thank you Madam President. It is our intention to recess in a moment for approximately half an hour so that a new Go list can be compiled. Points of personal privilege.

THE CHAIR:

At this time the Chair would like to announce members of a Conference Committee on bills that have just passed that would put us in conflict with the House that is on Calendar 363. Committee of Conference will be Senator Kevin Sullivan, Senator Edith Prague, Senator Tony Guglielmo.

On Page 23, the Committee of, I'm sorry, Page 22, Calendar 490, Senator LeBeau, Senator Crisco, and Senator Smith. The members of that Conference Committee will meet and report back. It would be

H-767

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1997

VOL. 40

PART 9

3090-3474

gtf

60

House of Representatives

Tuesday, May 20, 1997

REPRESENTATIVE GODFREY: (110th)

Mr. Speaker, I'd move that this item be referred to the Public Safety Committee.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HYSLOP:

Seeing no objection, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

On page 29, Calendar 592, Substitute for SB1162,
An Act Concerning Licensure of Marriage and Family
Therapists, Sanitarians, Speech Pathologists,
Podiatrists, Opticians, Acupuncturists, Clinical Social
Workers, Massage Therapists, Veterinarians, Retired
Health Care Providers and Paramedics, as amended by
Senate Amendment Schedules A and B. Favorable report
of the Committee on Government Administration and
Elections.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HYSLOP:

Representative Godfrey.

REPRESENTATIVE GODFREY: (110th)

Mr. Speaker, I would move that this item be referred to the Appropriations Committee.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HYSLOP:

Seeing no objection, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

On page 31, Calendar 602, Substitute for SB938, An
Act Concerning Water Utility Coordinating Committees,

H-768

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1997

VOL. 40
PART 10
3475-3848

gmh

43

003517

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 22, 1997

Clerk, please call Calendar 592.

CLERK:

On page 37, Calendar 592, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 1162, AN ACT CONCERNING LICENSURE OF MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPISTS, SANITARIANS, SPEECH PATHOLOGISTS, PODIATRISTS, OPTICIANS, ACUPUNCTURISTS, CLINICAL SOCIAL WORKERS, MASSAGE THERAPISTS, VETERINARIANS, RETIRED HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS AND PARAMEDICS. Favorable Report of the Committee on Appropriations.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Godfrey.

REP. GODFREY: (110TH)

What was that? I would move that this item be referred to the committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Don't act like Vinnie Chase now.

REP. GODFREY: (110TH)

Okay.

SPEAKER RITTER:

So ordered. As I always try to tell the Chairs in some cases try to work expeditiously and some cases not so expeditiously in terms of -- and with that, we will return to the call of the Calendar.

H-772

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1997

VOL. 40
PART 14
4976-5353

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

It's nice to see your Mayor, Mayor of the burgess of Naugatuck, is that what it is? No the borough of Naugatuck, where they have burgesses, yes. It's always nice to have you, in your old seat there too, huh? Well if you want to hang around for a few more days we'd love to have you. Okay, seriously congratulations. Clerk please call Calendar 592.

CLERK:

On page forty-one, Calendar 592, substitute for SB1162. AN ACT CONCERNING LICENSURE OF MARRIAGE AND FAMILY THERAPISTS, SANITARIANS, SPEECH PATHOLOGISTS, PODIATRISTS, OPTICIANS, ACUPUNCTURISTS, CLINICAL SOCIAL WORKERS, MASSAGE THERAPISTS, VETERINARIANS, RETIRE HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS AND PARAMEDICS. The Senate adopted Senate schedules "A" and "B" on May 14th. Favorable report of the Committee on Finance which recommends passage with Senate "A" and "B."

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Good afternoon Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Good afternoon, madam, you have the floor Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Thank you, thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable

kmr

71

005223

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Motion on acceptance and passage in concurrence with the Senate, please proceed madam.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I just would like to first explain the underlying bill before I call some amendments that would make some clarifications and changes. The underlying bill, I guess the title kind of says it all is basically technical and minor changes, modifications, of current health care professional licensure.

In other words, those statutes are already on the books that are overseen by the Department of Public Health. And again, as I say, basically in the description in the title of the bill. At this time Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call the first amendment that the Senate adopted, that is LCO 9111 and would you please call, the Clerk please call and I be allowed to summarize.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Clerk has LCO 9111 if he may call and Representative Gerratana would like to summarize.

CLERK:

LCO 9111 Senate "A" offered by Senator Harp.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Senate amendment "A" eliminates provisions in the original bill which require the Department of Public Health to license paramedics. It also exempts veterinarians, it eliminates exempting veterinarians from disclosure during complaint investigations. And it eliminates requiring the DPH to adopt regulations and license renewals for retired medical personnel. It creates alternative licensure period requirement for marriage and family therapists.

It eliminates another alternative process that was in the original bill. It eliminates improper reference to radiology, in the radiologist section of the bill. It allows the department to establish continuing education requirement for opticians. It modifies the conditions for licensing certain marriage therapists and it also modifies language regarding social workers.

This amendment was also proposed and accepted in the Senate because the changes in the underlying bill, the bill had some heavy duty fiscal impact requirements and it eliminates those also, I move adoption Mr.

kmr

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Questions on the adoption of Senate "A" will you remark further? Representative Ward.

REP. WARD: (86th)

Mr. Speaker, through you a question to the proponent of the amendment.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Please proceed sir.

REP. WARD: (86th)

Through you Mr. Speaker, direct the lady's attention to lines 40 through 43 of the amendment which seems to be semi-special act language of a particular grandfather clause. And I would just ask if the lady can indicate if there is a particular person that this has been put in place for, and if so they could share with us who that might be?

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Mr. Speaker, just by looking at the language, I think this had to do with, yes it had to do with social worker, I remember doing a licensing bill a year or two ago, there were some employees that were I believe it involved state government, I think they were employees

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

not just one employer Representative Ward, that had--it says, was an employee of the federal government with not less than 3000 hours, it was probably one a licensure requirement. But I believe in my recollection Representative Ward, that it was more than one employee. And I believe that the reason why this change has been made is to probably eliminate that requirement because it is no longer needed. Through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Ward.

REP. WARD: (86th)

Through you Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear that there may be more than one person. It just seems to me that this is a requirement that they have had the experience prior to 1986, that experience then obviously having ended 11 years ago. Is there any requirement reading this section with others that, that person has been practicing recently or are we grandfathering somebody in, or a group of people in that may not have been actively engaged in the field for up to 11 years? Through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

Through you Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information Representative Ward. Again, this underlying bill is a compilation of many different bills that came before the Public Health Committee regarding licensure, and I'm not aware of what the genesis of that is. Through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Ward.

REP. WARD: (86th)

I thank the lady for her answer. I guess just think when we put in these very particular type of grandfather clauses we ought to be careful and ought to have some information as to how it applies. As long as there's representation that it applies to a class of people and it isn't just for one or two people.

Without any other information, I guess that's acceptable. I would hope that as we further debate the bill perhaps somebody from the department or otherwise could indicate what this is really needed for. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Will you remark? Representative Simmons.

REP. SIMMONS: (43rd)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Through you a question to the proponent of the amendment.

kmr

005228
76

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

SPEAKER RITTER:

Please proceed.

REP. SIMMONS: (43rd)

Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker, on lines 45, 46 and 47 of the amendment we're dealing with issue relative to body massage or therapeutic massage and this provides certain clarification in that section which deals with people with advanced degrees from a foreign institution of higher learning with a focus on therapeutic massage as having a minimum as ten years experience as a massage therapist.

If indeed a person represents himself having graduated from such an institution and having had such experience, how is that verified by the state of Connecticut? What procedure does the state of Connecticut use to verify if this person has an appropriate degree from a foreign institution and has the requisite ten years of experience? Through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Thank you through you Mr. Speaker. Certification and verification of the different requirements for certification the educational requirements. I believe

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

that when the applicant or the person who is interested in becoming licensed applies that there are forms that they fill out their background and education. I do have the legislative liaison here from the Department of Public Health who could probably tell me if you will hold for just a minute exactly how that application is verified.

REP. SIMMONS: (43rd)

Thank you.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Thank you Mr. Speaker through you. As an employee would and so forth they do verification by telephone work, by sending letters for verification of the fact that they went to school. They send letters of inquiry did this person attend this educational institution or this institution. Through you Mr. Speaker.

REP. SIMMONS: (43rd)

The reason I raise the question is because in my district I've had a situation involving two people who are, I guess you'd say are professional masseurs who spent over a year trying to get certified here in the state of Connecticut when in fact their experience and degrees were from Texas. It just occurred to me that

kmr

78 005230

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

if it takes over a year to validate and verify that somebody has the records or degrees from a Texas university and has the experience of working Texas and California what are we going to do when somebody presents themselves--let's say from Thailand or Singapore or Japan? It would seem to me that it would be almost impossible to validate these people's educational background and work experience which is listed here as 10 years.

Has the department had an first hand experience in approving people who have come in from foreign countries? Through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Through you Mr. Speaker, yes, I'm speaking with a legislative liaison here and she says yes, there has been experience in verification. Usually our licensing statutes Representative Simmons, through you Mr. Speaker, is a process of establishing the educational requirements. Usually we have reciprocity. There are certain standards which have to be met for requirements.

Those are obviously, or I would assume, under rules and regs, statutes and under rules and regs this

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

is a process of verification and so forth. She does attest that there have been verifications done before for people who have lived out of this state and out of this country. Through you Mr. Speaker.

REP. SIMMONS: (43rd)

Alternatively, or I should say the other side of the coin--and this is an issue again that we've experienced in southeastern Connecticut--is people coming from foreign countries who are representing themselves as masseurs who in fact are engaged in other activities primarily, prostitution in particular.

What mechanism does the department have to insure that, that is not the primary focus of activity in the licensing process? Through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Through you Mr. Speaker, again speaking with the legislative liaison from the Department of Public Health, there's a variety of ways to--as I stated before to you--to confirm whether this person is indeed a massage therapist and not some other profession or practice or whatever.

Because the statutory--the underlying statutory language--is very specific in the requirements. If

kmr

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

that person--you or I could be, we're certainly are legislators--we're not licensed to be legislators but we perform our profession and we perform other duties out in the real world so to speak. In doing so, we might be licensed in another profession, but we often do this. So the verification goes to the requirements in statute for the licensure. What that person does in addition their professional qualifications as verified, having gone through the exams, having met all the education requirements is something that I cannot answer or really speak to. But you know to give you just a scenario. Through you Mr. Speaker.

REP. SIMMONS: (43rd)

I thank you for you for those answers and I think you've satisfied my concern that the Department is prepared to deal with both sets of issues. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Dickman.

REP. DICKMAN: (132nd)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of this amendment. I think it's about time that we had all of this put together in one package, all these licensure. And I think it's particularly important for the massage therapist.

kmr

005233
81

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

Because the original bill back two years ago had some cracks that people were falling through and it became necessary to tighten it up and I think this bill, makes the whole process a lot better and I urge everybody to support the amendment.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Will you remark further on Senate "A"?

Representative Piscopo from the 76th.

REP. PISCOPO: (76th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. A question through you to the proponent of the amendment please.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Please proceed.

REP. PISCOPO: (76th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker the original file copy section 13 provided for a break in the license renewal fee for a retired health care professional. I'm wondering if the proponent can tell me if I'm reading the amendment right that the amendment in effect takes section 13 of the file out and it seems that there is another section 13 provided in different wording. Through you Mr. speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

Yes, through you Mr. Speaker, that is correct. This Senate amendment "A" excludes what was in the original file copy regarding the retired medical personnel and it says, substitute in lieu thereof, Commissioner of Public Health and so forth. Through you Mr. Speaker.

REP. PISCOPO: (76th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker and thank the proponent. I'm some what disappointed that, that section got taken out of this file. As you know I've been trying to get something through for a number of years now to give retired health care professionals a break in their licensure, so that they could perform volunteer services in their community.

I talked to a lot of members on the other side of the aisle and they helped me with the language. And over the years I think I've done enough homework on this to a point where I think its time is due. A number of members in the Chamber have said that they do support this amendment and they feel this is a very important bill, and so I'm somewhat hesitant to call another amendment that would do this.

And I just won't call the amendment, but we had the same debate last week Mr. Speaker. But I'm some what disappointed that Section 13 was taken out of this

kmr

83

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

file. Thank you.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Thank you sir. Will you remark further on the adoption of Senate "A"? If not I'll try your minds, all in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Opposed no. Senate "A" is adopted. Will you remark further as amended by Senate "A"?

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have another amendment adopted in the Senate, amendment "B" as they adopted it, LCO 4695 if the Clerk would please call and I would be allowed to summarize.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Clerk does have LCO 4695 you may call and Representative Gerratana would like to summarize.

CLERK:

LCO 4695, Senate "B" offered by Senator Gunther, et al.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

Thank you Mr. Speaker. This amendment modifies the original bill's provision reopening opportunities for licensure as an acupuncturist until January 1st, 1998 and revises the licensing requirements as summarized. I move adoption.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Questions on the adoption of Senate "B" will you remark further on the adoption of Senate "B"? If not I'll try your minds, all in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Opposed no. Senate "B" clearly has it. Will you remark further on this bill as amended by Senate "A" and Senate "B"? Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Thank you, I have one more amendment to call. It is LCO 9464 and will the Clerk please call and I be allowed to summarize?

SPEAKER RITTER:

Clerk has LCO 9464, if you may call and Representative Gerratana would like to summarize.

CLERK:

LCO 9464 House "A" offered by Representative

McDonald, et al.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a screening amendment, well amendment--language that strikes section 13 of the bill. The language in section 13 was extremely confusing and at this time it is better to clean up the bill by adopting this amendment. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Question on adoption of House "A" will you remark further on the adoption of House "A"? Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker a question through you to Representative Gerratana.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Please proceed sir.

REP. CLEARY: (80th)

Is this section 13 allowing the Commissioner of Public Health to designate a senior staff member to take care of some of his statutory duties? Is that correct, through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

kmr

86 005238

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. The section 13 would--say the Commissioner may designate a deputy or other senior staff member. So that is correct, through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80th)

Through you Mr. Speaker, why is that you're recommending that, that be deleted from the Senate amendment?

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you. There was discussion, from what I understand about this language it is conflicting. In the sense that it gives, the Commissioner rather gives power, designates power to deputy or other senior staff member and then takes that power away with the same language further on.

Also there was concern about a fiscal note, because this may have the intention, or may have the intention of providing for another deputy commissioner, something which was felt was not appropriate in this

kmr

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

bill, through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80th)

Through you Mr. Speaker, were any of these concerns brought up at the public hearing that we had on this language?

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Through you Mr. Speaker, I'm going to check on that if you'll give me just a second.

SPEAKER RITTER:

The Chamber will stand at ease for a moment. The Chamber will come back into order, Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Thank you Mr. Speaker, through you to Representative Cleary. Yes, we did have a public hearing on this particular language. However, in this Chamber we certainly know that as things go forward, that certain concerns are brought forth. I know in another related bill I'm dealing with--certain concerns that we thought were resolved through the public hearing process in our committee and this is the

kmr

88 005240

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

situation in with this particular language, through you
Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80th)

Through you Mr. Speaker, have you spoken with the
Commissioner of Health and is he in concurrence with
deletion of this language?

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Through you Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken with
the commissioner of the department of Public Health.
Through you.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Thank you Representative
Gerratana.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Will you remark further on the adoption of House
"A"? Will you remark further? If not, I'll try your
minds. All in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

kmr

89 005241

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

SPEAKER RITTER:

Opposed no. House "A" is adopted. Will you remark further on this bill as amended by Senate "A," Senate "B," and House "A"? If not, Representative Wasserman from the 106th.

REP. WASSERMAN: (106th)

Good morning Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Good afternoon madam. Let's not get to good morning yet.

REP. WASSERMAN: (106th)

Very briefly I intend to very briefly I intend to unfortunately or unhappily vote against this bill because in reference to sanitarian qualifications in section 4b of the bill. Although we have drafted an amendment, I do not intend to call it, but I do want to be on the record as saying I have to oppose the bill. Thank you.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Thank you madam, will you remark further on this bill? If not, Representative Kerensky.

REP. KERENSKY: (14th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the proponent of the bill.

SPEAKER RITTER:

kmr

005242
90

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

Please proceed madam.

REP. KERENSKY: (14th)

I would like to know in the section dealing with the speech language pathologist, whether the new provision to use supervised support personnel will apply in situations where the licensed speech language pathologist has direct authority over supervision, evaluation, hiring and firing of the support personnel.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Thank you, through you Mr. Speaker. The bill allows licensed speech pathologists to use supervised support personnel to help them with routine tests. The tasks are delineated, they may be designed licensed, designated--I'm sorry, by the licensed speech pathologist and related to maintaining a assistive and prosthetic devices, recording and charting or implementing evaluation and intervention.

My understanding is that this change in here was brought about by a situation where speech pathologists cannot address the needs of every student in an educational setting. Therefore, speech pathologist as well as those people who assist speech pathologist thought that this would be an appropriate answer and

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

solution to the situation that exists out there.

Through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Kerensky.

REP. KERENSKY: (14th)

Thank you Representative Gerratana. Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have a concern about this section of the bill and it's more of a philosophical statement than it is specific about the bill. I just would like to clarify first, that to the proponent of the bill, through you Mr. Speaker. That in the case of school systems, that the person who is supervising the support personnel, namely the licensed certified speech language pathologist. Would very likely not be the person responsible for the assessment, hiring and firing of the person.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Mr. Speaker, I apologize I do not believe, I did not hear the question. Could Representative Kerensky please repeat that?

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Kerensky please repeat the question madam.

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

REP. KERENSKY: (14th)

I just would like to clarify that my understanding is correct and that if one of these newly licensed support persons were working in a school system, it would likely not be the supervising speech language pathologist who would have the authority over supervision, hiring and firing of the individual.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

I don't believe the bill addresses that at all, concerning hiring and firing. This is just license requirements. Through you Mr. Speaker, and I don't believe that is addressed in this bill and I don't really know if it's somewhere else in statute. But as far as hiring and firing I don't have knowledge of who does that, or that this bill would affect that.

Through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Kerensky.

REP. KERENSKY: (14th)

Thank you through you Mr. Speaker Representative Gerratana. It is exactly that process which is of

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

concern to me. The way school system administrations are set up it is generally the supervisor, director of personnel or some other person that would be responsible for the supervision, assessment, hiring and firing of everyone under that umbrella. And so, I need to share with this Chamber that I have been a licensed certified speech language pathologist for many years.

The only other time that I was ever in this building before I became a candidate was to testify more than 25 years ago on a bill that was brought by, that was initiated at the request of the school system administrations, saying they wished to hire speech language pathologists who did not meet the professional criteria of the field. That licensure requires a masters degree, it requires an internship and it requires passing of an examination.

Their rationale was they couldn't find qualified people to hire. And therefore, it wasn't a matter of lowering standards it was simply a matter of being able to service the children. Fortunately in my view the members of the committee and subsequently the legislature listened and the standards were not lowered. It's back, in a worse form. I understand the pressures of managed care.

I understand the pressures of providing services

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

now to preschool children and the growing number of people in nursing homes that require this and other therapeutic efforts. I understand the salary constraints on boards of education and on towns. And I understand that in this bill which was carefully negotiated that the provisions are more stringent and more responsive than those that are being recommended nationally and that other states are adopting, and for that I thank the people who worked on this.

And I thank them for being more cautious. And what I would like to do is basically sound an alarm, that I think we're hearing now and we're going to hear over and over again. We can justify the need for this service, but let's be very clear that what we're doing is treating the symptom and ignoring the cause.

And the cause is a rapidly growing organism that we're not going to be able to address in this chamber. We can provide people, but we will not be able to address the need in the same way as the highly trained professional would do.

Part of the reason we don't have the highly trained professionals available is because of what we've done to the job requirements. We're over burdening people over and over again, with case loads of 50 or more people, huge amounts of paper work and

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

less and less opportunity in that professional day for which we are paying professional salaries to work with people and solve the problems that they're supposed to do. The burdens are everywhere and a lot of them come at the state level.

I can tell you that the state Department of Education requires of speech language pathologists working in school systems in order to access the school based health service federal funds, 800 individual reports over the course of the school year for that school system to be eligible for that money. I guess that makes the state Department of Education feel that there is some level of accountability.

But if you think about how long it takes to fill out 800 forms and how much time that takes away from providing services for children, you might understand what some of this is about. I think we really need to look at what the priority is for providing services that are preventative, truly rehabilitative and mostly essential, appropriate and delivered in a timely fashion. I thank you for listening, and I'm unfortunately I think this is going to be the first of many of these issues for which we will be dancing around the edge and never addressing the problem until it's much bigger and much costlier. Thank you.

kmr

96 005248

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

SPEAKER RITTER:

Will you remark further on this bill?

Representative Piscopo.

REP. PISCOPO: (76th)

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Mr. Speaker I just got up and gave this speech on colleague courtesy and how I wouldn't offer this amendment because I understand it's an important bill. And then not more than a minute after I sat down an amendment gets offered and sends it back up to the Senate. And having said that with the bill going back up to the Senate, I might as well offer my amendment now. So the Clerk has.

SPEAKER RITTER:

That's a great explanation sir, it is. That's very clear and concise and accurate. You have the floor sir.

REP. PISCOPO: (76th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has LCO 9718, will the Clerk please call and I be allowed to summarize?

SPEAKER RITTER:

Clerk has LCO 9718, if she may call it and Representative Piscopo would like to summarize.

CLERK:

LCO 9718, designated as House "B" offered by Representative Piscopo.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Piscopo.

REP. PISCOPO: (76th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. This bill would allow for a \$10.00 renewal fee for those nurses that are under retired status, I move adoption.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Questions on adoption, will you remark further Representative Piscopo.

REP. PRELLI: (63rd)

Thank you.

SPEAKER RITTER:

I'm sorry, will you remark further on the adoption of House "B"?

REP. PISCOPO: (76th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Chamber hear quite an extended debate on this amendment earlier, something close to it earlier, I just lowered the fee to make it even better for our retired nurses to \$10.00. And I hope the Chamber this time can see fit to pass it. Thank you.

SPEAKER RITTER:

I hope your good campaign workers. Will you

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

remark further on the adoption of House "B"?

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Mr. Speaker, thank you Mr. Speaker, through you. This is the third amendment of its kind I have seen so far this session on retired personnel, in this case nurses. Again, I must rise to strongly oppose this amendment. We took it out of the original underlying bill because of the considerable fiscal note that was attached to it.

One that both the Department and members of the Public Health Committee have talked about and have felt that it would be certainly inappropriate and one that we could not fund, so therefore, Mr. Speaker I urge rejection of this amendment.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Thank you. Will you remark further?
Representative Flaherty, from the 68th.

REP. FLAHERTY: (68th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Representative Piscopo's amendment. And you're right it just keeps on coming back. And some of the issues it takes us--you know in the land of steady habits it takes this Chamber and this legislature a while sometimes to come around to a good idea. And I

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

know we have debated this before, a similar amendment.

We are sending the bill upstairs, I actually think, probably would have been better on this bill if we said lower not licensing seeing that we've loaded it up so far. I don't think this is going to kill the bill. It's a worthwhile thing to allow a lower licensing fee for the nurses who want to volunteer and I think we still have some time and we can work on the fiscal note or whatever.

I think Representative Piscopo deserves this amendment, I think the people of the state deserve this amendment, and certainly the people, those retired nurses who could be out in the field, deserve the opportunity to have a break on their licensing fee. I support the amendment. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Thank you sir. Representative McDonald.

REP. MCDONALD: (148th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I think Representative Piscopo should perhaps have a citation for persistence. I have to rise we've had this as was said two other times this session. This is not something that's being mean to nurses whose license cost \$50.00 for renewal. It creates a nightmare for the department.

And people who are going to be volunteer nurses

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

registered and those that aren't when they decide they are not going to be retired any more they come back in and re-register as full-time nurses that aren't volunteers anymore. It has a large fiscal note to it. It's very difficult to keep track of this. The renewal license for nurses is not that high. If people want to go out and volunteer it's not going to keep them from volunteering.

I know a lot of nurses who haven't practiced for years and they just keep renewing their license in case they ever have to use it some time. I would really urge rejection of this amendment. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gyle.

REP. GYLE: (108th)

Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would urge the Chamber to support this amendment. It's an idea who's time has come. And to be honest with you, I do not believe the fiscal note on this. Because the Department doesn't want it. Whenever the Department doesn't want something they put a huge fiscal not on it. Let's be perfectly honest about this, all they have to do stamp a large red R on the license and people will know when they see the license which they have to show in order

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

to work, that these people are retired, and therefore not eligible to go back to work on a full-time basis or to work in an ongoing process for pay. These people who want to do volunteer work and want to have license even though they are retired are entitle to have license at a much lower fee.

I understand that \$50.00 to people who make as much money as we do is not a lot of money. But there are people living on fixed incomes who actually make less than us. And for them it is a hardship and I would ask the Chamber to please support this amendment.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Thank you madam. Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER: (55th)

Mr. Speaker, for those of us who have been involved in many one time annual events where there is a need to have medical personnel on staff, often times it is hard to get someone to do it. With the nurses certainly with their revolving schedules and so on and so forth. We have looked at this when it comes down to the Hebron Fair trying to keep someone on staff for the full four days.

We have talked to different people, they are retired--in the instance of retired nurses--that would like to do it, and this is where I have been approached

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

that they would like to have certainly a reduction in their fee schedule. Yes, the Hebron Fair isn't a major thing, but we're looking at an event that is meant to be for a non-profit agency that does a lot of good in the community, I think this is an extension of that situation. Referring to what Representative Gyle said, we are talking about people until recent years did not make a whole lot of money.

And then in reference to what Representative McDonald said, I would counter that with the Department of Education is certainly able to give different types of licenses for teachers as they are coming up through the system, I see no reason why the Department of Public Health cannot stamp the "R" on it and make a very simple system as nurses are coming back down from the other side of the side of the system. Thank you sir.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Mr. Speaker, thank you Mr. Speaker, I speak again to oppose this amendment. The Department of Public Health, the fiscal concern is overwhelming, but it is also a matter of trying to decide what kind of health care quality a retired person under this bill would

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

deliver.

And in that sense, just to clarify that, there are problems with, that would definitely have to be worked out and I believe should be addressed at another time, not an amendment on this bill, regarding what those volunteer services would be, would it still be the same kind of services that a nurse would do.

I have many questions about that, and therefore, I do rise to oppose this. And Mr. Speaker, the when the vote is taken I request that it be taken by roll call.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Gerratana.

REP. GERRATANA: (23rd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did request that when the vote be taken it be taken by roll call.

SPEAKER RITTER:

All those in favor of roll call signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER RITTER:

We'll take a roll call. Will you remark further on this bill, House "B"? Will you remark further? If not staff and guests come to the well of the House, the machine will be open.

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call, members to the Chamber. The House is voting by roll call on House "B", members to the Chamber please.

SPEAKER RITTER:

If all members have voted please check the roll call machine to make sure your vote is properly cast. The machine will be locked. Clerk please take a tally. Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House "B" to Senate Bill 1162.

Total Number Voting	143
Necessary for Adoption	72
Those voting Yea	63
Those voting Nay	80
Those absent and not voting	8

SPEAKER RITTER:

House "B" fails. Will you remark further as amended by House "A"? If not staff and guests come to the well of the House, the machine will be open.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call, members to the Chamber. The House is voting by roll call, members to the Chamber please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER HYSLOP:

kmr

105

House of Representatives

May 31, 1997

Have all members have voted? If all members have voted please check the roll call machine to be sure your vote is properly recorded, the machine will be locked. Clerk will take a tally. Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1162 as amended by Senate "A" and "B" and House "A."

Total Number Voting	142
Necessary for Passage	72
Total voting Yea	140
Those voting Nay	2
Those absent and not voting	9

DEPUTY SPEAKER HYSLOP:

Bill as amended passes. Clerk please call Calendar 623.

CLERK:

On page forty-one, Calendar 623, SB676. AN ACT CONCERNING A WAIVER OF FOOD STAMP PARTICIPATION RESTRICTION. As amended by Senate amendment schedule "A." Favorable report of the Committee on Government Administration and Elections.

SPEAKER RITTER:

Representative Abrams.

REP. ABRAMS: (83rd)

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

PUBLIC
HEALTH
PART 3
736-1136

1997

143
kmg

PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

March 6, 1997

And many of us from the 1960s, 1970s developed out patient ambulatory foot surgery. A new generation of podiatrists came into the state and they eradicated all minimal incision surgery and now hospital podiatry dominates the profession.

And they use various tactics, including disciplinary action against me. Every year patients call me in need of minimal incision surgery. I have to refer them out of state to our neighbors, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, where minimal incision surgery has not been suppressed. And this is the reason that I'm not given a license, based on professional discrimination.

And concluding, and I, just please bear with me. I'd just like to give you some numbers. There's only about fifty to sixty acupuncturists in Connecticut of our state of over three million people. That means, if every acupuncturist can practice, the ratio is about one to fifty thousand, sixty thousand.

Only a partial number have been licensed. I think about twenty-five, thirty. That's a ratio of about one to 100,000. This is a needed service. There's so few of us here. We work together with the conventional medicine. We all are holistic practitioners. And if you deny us of our livelihoods and of our life's dedication, you're denying our Connecticut citizens of a valuable health service. Thank you.

SEN. GUNTHER: Thank you, any questions. Thank you. We'll now move on to SB1162. First speaker will be Andy Lees, followed by Glynis Harrell.

BETTY GALLO: As you know, I'm not Andy Lees. I'm Betty Gallo and I represent the Connecticut Speech Hearing Language Association. And we're going to offer you a deal. And that is for instead of four of us, you'll get two of us. But two of the people actually had to go home and provide speech therapy for children, which is what they do for a living.

I represent the Connecticut Speech Language and

Hearing Association. It is a Connecticut professional association of speech language pathologists, audiologists, and speech scientists, which is dedicated to improving our services in Connecticut.

They have 900 members in Connecticut who work in all types of settings with clients of all ages and all types of disabilities. The majority of the membership provide services to our youngsters in our public schools.

And we're here to support bill SB1162. The intent of the proposed legislation is to permit speech language pathologists to use paraprofessionals as part of the delivery of their services. The use of special, supervised support personnel trained to augment and assist speech language pathologists, as defined in the legislation, is approved by the National Association, and in practice in many other states.

Due to the expanding need for qualified need for speech language pathologists, is difficult for our schools to provide mandated services. There is a national study that says that that is untrue throughout our school system, but especially in our urban schools.

This bill SB1162 will allow speech language pathologists to reach and assist more students, and do it with less expenditure of special education funding by adopting the careful legislation which is before you today. Thank you.

SEN. GUNTHER: Any questions? Thank you. Andy Lees?

DR. GLYNIS KING HARRELL: No, I'm Dr. Glynis King Harrell.

SEN. GUNTHER: Alright, you've signed up in two places, second and third.

DR. GLYNIS KING HARRELL: Oh, okay.

SEN. GUNTHER: You're going to do both of them now?

DR. GLYNIS KING HARRELL: No.

SEN. GUNTHER: Okay, thank you.

DR. GLYNIS KING HARRELL: I'm only going to speak once. Good afternoon honorable members of the committee. My name is Dr. Glynis King Harrell. I'm a certified and licensed speech language pathologist of fifteen years, and I am here today on behalf of Dr. Reginal Mayo, and the New Haven public schools, to express our support of SB1162, which would exempt support personnel from licensure as speech language pathologists.

Changes in service delivery models, increasing numbers of ethnically diverse communicatively disordered individuals, and rising costs of service provision in both educational and medical studies, require a change in the scope of practice for the speech pathologist.

This change in practice must expand to include management and supervision of speech assistance. This is a practice which has proven its effectiveness in several other disciplines, and has provided the public with timely access to effective intervention through the use of physician assistance, nursing aids, dental hygienists, and teaching paraprofessionals, to name a few.

The use of speech assistance with increase the availability of service to a diverse population. In a profession which boasts a national membership of 90,000 strong, only 6,500 are minority. This utilization of support personnel from ethnically diverse backgrounds, will ensure access to an otherwise under served population.

Support personnel cannot ever supplant the licensed professional. The assistant would only implement activities which have been designed by and under the supervision of qualified professionals. The American Speech Language and Hearing Association along with the Connecticut Speech Language and Hearing Association, and the Connecticut State Department of Education have acknowledged the need for support personnel.

146
kmg

PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

March 6, 1997

Consumer protection and quality assurance remain intact through national and local guidelines which have been developed by professional speech organizations. Licensure laws in approximately thirty other states recognize the use of speech support personnel.

On behalf of the communicatively disordered children and adults of this state, I urge you to support this bill. Provide equal access to an under served population, allow my chosen profession to meet the challenge of expansion, and increasing demands through the utilization of support personnel in the practice of speech language pathologist. Thank you very much.

SEN. GUNTHER: Thank you. Any questions? Thank you.

DR. GLYNIS KING HARRELL: Thank you.

SEN. GUNTHER: Barbara Bard. Barbara Bard? Not here? Oh, she left, okay. That completes SB1162. Moving on to SB1163. Wes Sager, followed by Shirley Cooper. In reverse order, Candito Carroccia, they'll probably prefer to have you now. Cause I'm murdering those names worse than you do. I really reversed them.

SHIRLEY COOPER: Good afternoon Senator Harp, and members of the Public Health Committee. We'd like to thank you for raising bill SB1163. I'm Shirley Cooper, the first vice president of the American Massage Therapy Association of Connecticut Chapter.

I'm also representing the field of massage therapy, of which there are now 1,300 licensed therapists in the state, as well as my being a practitioner for thirteen and a half years.

In order to protect the public, the public who have come to rely on massage therapy as a viable health care modality, we need to maintain the highest of standards regarding education for future licensure candidates.

Our current statute has undergone several changes over the past two legislative sessions that have

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

PUBLIC
HEALTH
PART 4
1137-1538-A

1997

**CONNECTICUT SPEECH-LANGUAGE-HEARING ASSOCIATION, INC.**

**213 BACK LANE
NEWINGTON, CT 06111
(203) 666-6900
FAX (203) 667-0144**

This information and opinion is offered to the Public Health Committee in support of Senate Bill No.1162 - an Act Exempting Supervised Support Personnel From Licensure As Speech Pathologists

The proposal addresses a clear and present need to permit speech pathologists to responsibly utilize assistants within the programs which provide (disabled) student services in the schools and patient services in hospitals and clinics. Similar to the roles of the paraprofessionals working with classroom and special education teachers, speech pathology assistants may provide support by implementing a variety of routine procedures that are an integral part of many of those programs. When a licensed professional is relieved (to any degree) from routine tasks (practice drills with a student, material preparation, equipment checks, etc.) that professional, the employers, the students and patients and their families will all benefit from the time that can then be allocated by the speech pathologist to a volume of challenging instructional and rehabilitative work.

The proposal addresses the need for consumer protection and quality assurance by defining the circumstances under which support personnel may be utilized - in accordance with the utilization and supervision guidelines established by the American Speech Language Hearing Association. In this way, support personnel cannot ever supplant or replace the professional, they can only implement that which is designed, monitored and supervised by a speech pathologist.

There is much established context for this proposal. In a recent national survey of (school-based) speech pathologists, those who worked with assistants were overwhelmingly positive about having this resource available to them. The American Speech Language Hearing Association has recognized the viable and integral role of support personnel and has published guidelines in their use and supervision. The Connecticut State Department of Education has awarded grants to local districts for the purpose of utilizing speech assistants and continues to administer a federal grant in pupil services which includes a support personnel component. The licensure laws of some thirty states across the country recognize speech pathology support personnel. Finally, every day in every school, hospital and clinic, teacher aides, occupational and physical therapy assistants provide much valued support to their professional cohorts.

I urge your support of this bill, the challenge of responding to the needs of children and adults with disabilities requires our use of every possible resource.

Respectfully Submitted

Carl Gross
Vice President for Governmental Affairs
Connecticut Speech Language Hearing Association



TESTIMONY PRESENTED BEFORE THE PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

Warren Wollschlager, Chief, Bureau of Regulatory Services, Tel.#509-7406

March 6, 1997

Bill #1162 AN ACT EXEMPTING SUPERVISED SUPPORT PERSONNEL FROM
LICENSURE AS SPEECH PATHOLOGISTS

The Department of Public Health supports Senate Bill #1162 with the following technical suggestion:

- This exemption should be limited to use by local and/or regional Boards of Education. These are the settings that have reported an inability to access sufficient numbers of licensed speech therapist to fulfill the State Department of Education's obligations to provide speech therapy to their student population.

With the inclusion of the above modification the Department would be able to support this legislation. Restricting the use of unlicensed support staff to local and/or regional Boards of Education would be sufficient to ensure appropriate oversight of these supportive personnel.

We urge the Committee to report favorably on this legislation. Thank you for your consideration of the Department's views on this bill.



Phone:

Telephone Device for the Deaf (860) 509-7191

410 Capitol Avenue - MS # _____

P.O. Box 340308 Hartford, CT 06134

An Equal Opportunity Employer

March 6, 1997

TESTIMONY OF
THEODORE S. SERGI, COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
BEFORE THE PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE
ON
S.B. 1162
AN ACT EXEMPTING SUPERVISED SUPPORT PERSONNEL FROM
LICENSURE AS SPEECH PATHOLOGISTS

We support S.B. 1162 which will give school districts more flexibility in providing speech and language services to children with communication impairments and disabilities while not detracting from the quality of those services. For more than a decade, Connecticut schools have reported difficulty securing adequate, qualified speech and language pathologists. We believe that properly trained and supervised support personnel can be a valuable resource in providing these services and therefore urge your approval of this legislation.