Good morning Senator Stillman, Representative Ritter and other distinguished members of the Public Health Committee.

My name is Jon Crane and I live in Burlington, Connecticut. I am here representing two organizations - the Chiropractic Stroke Awareness Group and Victims of Chiropractic Abuse.

I am here in opposition to H.B. No. 6258, an act concerning business names used by practicing chiropractors - To allow licensed chiropractors greater flexibility in selecting a business name.

Members of the groups I represent here, who have been trying to bring about change regarding neck adjustments and informed consent, have filed a lawsuit against the two chiropractic trade associations in Connecticut for routinely violating Section 1. Subsection (a) of section 20-32 of the Connecticut General Statutes where it states – " No person shall practice as a chiropractor under any name other than the name of the chiropractor actually owning the practice or a corporate name containing the name or names of such chiropractors."

The members of these groups have also filed complaints with the state Department of Public Health about chiropractors not following this portion of the law.

Coincidentally, this is the very same portion of the General Statutes the proponents of HB 6258 seek to have repealed.

The members of the groups I represent documented 458 violations of this portion of the General Statutes and attempted to present this documentation to investigators at the Department of Public Health. The DPH felt it was too large a number of violations to investigate and requested a representative sampling.

The groups then provided evidence of violations by three chiropractors who are members of the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners.

In a letter dated December 10, 2010 to Janet Levy, President of Victims of Chiropractic Abuse, Kathleen Boulware, Public Health Services Manager in the Practitioner Licensing and Investigation Section of the Department of Health said – and I quote – "The Department has determined that their current practice names do not meet the requirements of C.G.S. 20-32."

Ms. Boulware went on to report that the Department had – quote - "opened investigations on Drs. Imossi, Robotham and Powers. They have been advised that their signage is not in compliance with C.G.S. Section 20-32. The Department is currently waiting for their corrective actions plans."

Well, it seems that H.B. 6258 is their corrective action plan.

Those who are supposed to enforce the law have been breaking it and their answer is to simply change the law.

There's good reason for this portion of the law that they seek to repeal. This language was put there by its authors to protect the public interest – to make it clear to people seeking healthcare the nature of the practitioner. Complete transparency, so that people can make informed healthcare choices.

In years past, the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners has vigorously enforced this portion of the law and I have brought examples of cases for you to see for yourselves. Regrettably, there is no recent history of enforcement.

I have also brought examples, produced in a quick Google search, of how other states continue to vigorously enforce the so-called "use of name" law when chiropractors put themselves forward to the public. In Kansas in 2008, a chiropractor lost his license for 30-days and paid a $10,000 fine for violating a similar law.

But back here in Connecticut, chiropractors are now starting to name their practices in ways that we believe misleads the public.

For example, names such as Neural-Spinal Center, Comprehensive Orthopedic & Sports Physical Therapy Center, Back Pain Treatment Center, Connecticut Disk & Laser Therapy Center, Danbury Physical Medicine & Rehab Center, New Haven Accident & Injury Center, New Haven Medical Sports & Occupational Therapy. The list goes on and on.

The groups I represent are concerned that that the use of practice names like the ones I have just mentioned could very well cause some members of the public to believe that these are physical therapist offices or medical facilities when they are not.

We ask that you give consideration to the foundations of this part of Connecticut's law and why it was written so that chiropractors would be clearly identifiable, as any healthcare practitioner should be…and we ask that you reject H.B. 6258.

Thank you.