



**TESTIMONY OF  
CONNECTICUT HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE  
PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE  
Friday, March 12, 2010**

**SB 428, An Act Concerning Revisions To The Public Health Related Statutes**

The Connecticut Hospital Association (CHA) appreciates the opportunity to submit testimony in support of **SB 428, An Act Concerning Revisions To The Public Health Related Statutes**. CHA opposes this bill as written, specifically with respect to Sections 19 and 20.

Section 19 of SB 428 amends Section 19a-14 of the General Statutes, adding a new subsection (e) which would prevent the Department of Public Health (DPH) from issuing a license to any applicant against whom any disciplinary action is pending or who is the subject of an unresolved complaint with a professional licensing authority in another jurisdiction. CHA supports the intent of this section, to ensure that physicians practicing in Connecticut continue to be of the highest standards. As written, however, the language may be too limiting. It is our understanding that some states' licensing authorities may place a practitioner on administrative suspension if they have not complied with all of the administrative requirements of that state's licensing law ( e.g. submission of their most current proof of insurance). In some instances, the applicant may not be in compliance because they are in the process of moving to Connecticut. To address this issue, CHA respectfully requests that Section 19 be amended as follows:

Section 19a-14 of the 2010 supplement to the General Statutes is amended by adding subsection (e) as follows:

(NEW) (e) The department shall not issue a license to any applicant against whom professional disciplinary action is pending or who is the subject of an unresolved complaint with the professional licensing authority in another jurisdiction. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to minor administrative failures as determined by the department.

Section 20 of SB 428 amends subsection (b) of Section 52-1460, which protects a patient's sensitive medical information and only allows its release to the department under limited and narrowly drafted circumstances. As written, Section 20 of SB 428 modifies these strict protections and would allow the department access to sensitive medical information even if such information is protected by attorney–client privilege. CHA is not certain of the goal behind the modifications in Section 20 and would like to work with the Committee and DPH to address the concerns which gave rise to this section. As written, however, CHA urges the Committee to delete Section 20.

Thank you for your consideration of our position.

For additional information, contact CHA Government Relations at (203) 294-7310.