



P.O. Box 854, Litchfield, CT 06759 Tel- 860-567-3787 Fax 860-567-3591

Testimony of
James Williams, M.D.

In Opposition to
HB5654, An Act Allowing Dentists to Perform Certain Facial Therapies
as Part of Their Dental Practice

Before the Public Health Committee
February 11, 2019

Good morning, Senator Abrams, Rep. Steinberg, Sen. Somers, Rep. Petit and distinguished members of the Public Health Committee. My name James Williams, M.D. and I am a board-certified otolaryngologist practicing in a two-man practice in Waterbury. I am here today representing nearly 800 physicians in the above mentioned medical societies to testify in opposition to H.B. 5654 to allow dentists to administer neurotoxins and dermal fillers under their scope of practice.

I would like to echo the concerns raised by my physician colleagues in earlier testimony. What is deeply disturbing to members of these societies is that this bill seems to have come out of thin air.

As many of you are aware the above listed medical societies have participated in healthy scope of practice debates through the Department of Public Health Scope Review Process, (Public Act 11-209). One such DPH review was completed in December of last year involving the expansion of the PA Scope, for which numerous parties participated in.

In fact, it was the wisdom of this committee- spearheaded by Senator Harris, that passed the scope review bill, which provided a process through the DPH to vet requests for scope of practice by various health providers. This Public Act created a more reasonable and more inclusive process over a longer period of time to help all parties provide a broader and more robust dialog and provide facts to determine if a provers scope should be expanded to include a medical procedure not currently in their scope of if it is in the best interest of Connecticut citizens. To do so.



P.O. Box 854, Litchfield, CT 06759 Tel- 860-567-3787 Fax 860-567-3591

This Scope Review process, which is encouraged by the general assembly and supported by members of this committee was not followed by the dentists and because of this we have not had time to properly prepare a position, research the need for this encroachment into the practice of medicine or investigate any access issues that may support such an expansion.

This important process, which has been used effectively by numerous groups and organizations, and has been disregarded by the Connecticut Dental Association, involves the submission of proposals to the department. Once selected by the department for review, committees of interested parties are established to study the implications of proposed scope changes and make recommendations to this committee. We urge you to oppose HB 5654 because it is violates the tenates of Public Act 11-209, which serves the citizens of Connecticut well.

Thank you for your consideration and I urge your opposition to this proposal.