

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB 635	PA 516	FAY	1957
House	286, 2666		2
Senate	3039-3041		3
Public Health & Safety	8, 30, 519-523		6
			(11)

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

H-30

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY

HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1957

VOL. 7
PART 1
1-579
INDEX

Tuesday, February 19, 1957

Senate Bill No. 623. An act concerning payment of benefits and damages.

(Referred to the Committee on Judiciary and Governmental Functions.)

Senate Bill No. 633. An act concerning amending 195d of the 1955 Supplement to the General Statutes.

(Referred to the Committee on Public Health and Safety)

Senate Bill No. 635. An act concerning making and enforcement of Fire Safety Regulations.

(Referred to the Committee on Public Health and Safety)

Senate Bill No. 913. An act concerning payment of entry fees in transferred cases.

(Referred to the Committee on Judiciary and Governmental Functions)

Senate Bill No. 916. An act concerning actions brought by or against persons who have reached 65 years of age.

(Referred to the Committee on Judiciary and Governmental Functions)

Senate Bill No. 1007. An act authorizing the counties of the State to assume a portion of the expense of insurance coverage for deputy sheriffs.

(Referred to the Committee on Judiciary and Governmental Functions)

Senate Bill No. 1011. An act amending Section 314d increasing civil jurisdiction of Court of Common Pleas.

(Referred to the Committee on Judiciary and Governmental Functions)

H-34

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1957

VOL. 7
PART 5
2427-2922

Thursday, May 23, 1957

MR. ROWLEY: LEDYARD)

I move for acceptance and passage in concurrence.

We have many persons who feel they can drive without a license either under another name or after having their license taken away; To discourage this, this bill provides for an additional penalty for those who have second offense.

THE SPEAKER:

Question is on acceptance and passage in concurrence.

The 'ayes' have it. Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 1745. File 1098. Sub. for S.B. 635. Concerning making and enforcement of Fire Safety Regulations.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY.

MR. HATFIELD: (EAST HADDAM)

Clerk has an amendment.

THE CLERK: House Amend. Sched. "A" by Mr. Clapp of Berlin.

In Section 13, strike out "subdivision (g)."
In Section 13, line 24, change (h) to (g).

MR. HATFIELD:

I move the adoption of the amendment.

The reasons for these deletions is, or are, because they conflict with the Fire Safety code.

THE SPEAKER:

Remark further on the amendment. The 'ayes' have it.

The amendment is adopted.

MR. HATFIELD: This amend. has the approval of the Legis. Council.

I move for suspension of the rules for consideration of the

S-25

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1957

VOL. 7

PART 5

MAY 20-MAY 24

2546-3223

MAY 24, 1957

18

favorable report and passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

The question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and the passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark?

SENATOR SNYDER:

No further remarks.

THE CHAIR:

All those in favor signify by saying AYE, opposed? The report is accepted and the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Disagreeing Action. Favorable substitute report, Joint Standing Committee, Public Health and Safety, Senate Bill 635. An Act Making and enforcement of fire safety regulations. This bill was passed by the Senate May 16, '57. It was amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" on 5-23-57. It is in your files as File No. 1098.

THE CHAIR:

The Senator from the 11th.

SENATOR SQUILLO:

Mr. President, I move for reconsideration of this bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is upon reconsideration. Will you remark?

MAY 24, 1957

19

All those in favor of reconsideration of the bill will signify by saying AYE, opposed? It is under reconsideration.

SENATOR SQUILLO:

Will the Clerk please read the amendment?

THE CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Mr. Clapp of the town of Berlin: In section 13, strike out "subdivision (g)". In section 13, line 24, change (h) to (g).

SENATOR SQUILLO:

I move for the adoption of Schedule "A", Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on adoption of Schedule "A". Will you remark? Are there further remarks? All those in favor of the adoption of the amendment will signify by saying AYE, opposed? The amendment is adopted.

The Senator from the 11th.

SENATOR SQUILLO:

I move for the passage of the bill as adopting Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

The question is upon suspension of the rules. All those in favor signify by saying AYE, opposed? The rules are suspended. Now, will you have your motion for passage?

MAY 24, 1957

20

SENATOR SQUILLO:

I move for passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is upon acceptance of the committee's favorable bill and the passage of the bill as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A". All those in favor signify by saying AYE, opposed? The report is accepted and the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Business from the House. House Joint Resolution. Resolution to recall substitute for Senate Bill 808.

THE CHAIR:

The Senator from the 7th.

SENATOR SNYDER:

Mr. President, will the Clerk read the ...

THE CHAIR:

Is that the Committee of Recall? May we pass this temporarily, Senator?

SENATOR SNYDER:

Well, I move the adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

We are going to pass this matter temporarily, Senator.

SENATOR SNYDER:

May I ask the Clerk what we have as subject matter before the assembly at the present time?

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC HEALTH
AND
SAFETY**

**CONN.
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY
1957**

**CONNECTICUT
STATE LIBRARY**

FEBRUARY 7, 1957

8

No locks or fastenings to prevent free escape from the inside of any building should be installed except in mental, penal or correctional institutions where supervisory personnel is continually on duty and effective provisions are made to remove occupants in case of fire or other emergencies. These fundamental requirements have been incorporated in the Ryan bill - S.B. No. 635 (RYAN) AN ACT CONCERNING MAKING AND ENFORCEMENT OF FIRE SAFETY REGULATIONS, which is now pending before this session of the General Assembly.

There are other important items that must be considered in providing for the public safety, such as exits clearly visible, or the routes to reach them conspicuously indicated in such a manner that every occupant of every building who is physically and mentally capable will readily know the direction of escape from any point; each path of escape in its entirety so arranged and marked that the way to a place of safety outside is unmistakable. Adequate and reliably illumination for all exit facilities; fire alarm facilities to warn occupants of the existence of a fire; at least two means of egress remote from each other and so arranged that the reasonable safety of numbers of occupants may not be in danger by the blocking of any single means of egress vertical openings between floors suitably enclosed or protected as necessary to afford reasonable safety to occupants while using exits and to prevent the spread of fire, smoke or fumes through vertical openings from floor to floor before occupants have entered exits.

Chm. Squillo: Is there anyone else to speak on this bill?

Henry Thomas, Chief of Hartford Fire Department: Before speaking on H.B. No. 2076 (COMMITTEE) AN ACT CONCERNING APPLICATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE FIRE SAFETY CODE, I want to make a personal observation, that is rather ironic is that we're talking about fire safety in establishments and buildings with this assembly here. I would also like to state that I am in complete accord with the State Police Commissioner who spoke in his capacity as state fire marshal, and I think listening to his presentation is ample evidence of the competency of that office to prepare safety codes. This they have been doing as the committee knows for some time for all buildings excepting dwellings and industrial plants. That competency has been recognized, Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen, by outstanding organizations such as the National Board of Fire Underwriters and the National Fire Protection Association. And these regulations and standards have been prepared or will be prepared, I can assure you from personal information, they will be reasonable, with the objective of safety.

Representative of the Connecticut Federation of Labor:

The Connecticut Federation of Labor is in favor of the bill.

Mr. Fred Waterhouse, Manufacturers' Association:

I would like to talk just a bit on this. We considered this bill quite thoroughly, and we feel that if any code should be adopted to promote fire safety, it should be done by the Fire Marshall. Let me go back in history and point out some things which ought to be done by this Committee if it goes along with this bill. First, I would like to talk about the authority as it is in the statutes. Section 6367 of the General Statutes requires safe places of employment for all people working in a manufacturing plant; Section 3670 gives to the Labor Commission the authority to enforce these safety regulations; Section 4096 has to do with fire escapes on certain types of buildings, including manufacturing establishments; Section 4097 of the General Statutes of 1949 deals with the power to enforce the provisions which have to do with fire escapes; Section 4098 gives broad authority relative to fire escapes. We ought to ascertain what has already been done and then give grave consideration to any new law. If you give the Fire Marshall authority to establish a fire code and then the code doesn't coincide with the statutes which we already have on the books, what are you going to do then? The laws now provide for fire escapes under certain conditions. I think the fire marshall has the experience to carry this out and be governed by the fire code recommendations. I would also emphasize another thing, lets just don't pass another law; let's see what we've already got first and get ourselves on the right track if we have not been doing what should have been done in the past. After you clarify some of the points taken up here, we should get an answer to the bill of Senator Ryan, Senate Bill 735. ✓

Mr. T. M. Ford:

I am once again in the position of neither favoring nor opposing the bill. Just want to express my thoughts on it. We have heard citations from the statutes, and it sounds to me that authority for this is already given to various agencies. Section 3676 allows the State Fire Marshall to carry out the regulations; the last section of it allows him to order any hazards removed, and it says

PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

THURSDAY

APRIL 11, 1957

Rep. Rose E. Prokop, Presiding

Members Present: Senator Squillo
 Representatives Prokop, Fosdick, Draper,
 Hyde, Goldbeck, Ratkiewich, Strunk, Murray,
 Stolle, Shostak, Paavola.

S. B. No. 635 (RYAN) AN ACT CONCERNING MAKING AND ENFORCEMENT
 OF FIRE SAFETY REGULATIONS.

Sen. Ryan, 31st District, I would like to register in favor of S.B. No. 635. This bill is intended to modernize the present provisions in the statutes to conform with developments in the fire safety field and to facilitate the endorsement of fire regulations at the local level rather than depending on re-course Hartford every time there is a violation. It clears up the language of the statutes. I think the word "non-combustible" is a far more realistic word than fireproof when dealing with materials that are required in fire safety precautions.

The bill as it reads does not penalize those who have buildings perhaps not completely adaptable to ideal provisions that we would like to see put into effect today but it makes allowances for that, and I am quite sure that Captain Shaw will give you further specific details of the desirability of this bill.

Chm. Prokop: I am sorry to have to call you gentlemen out again on this bill, but it so happens this bill was in the General Law Committee, and it wasn't referred to Public Health and Safety until after we had the hearing on the other bills on the same subject, and for that reason, there is another hearing today on this bill. Is there anyone here to speak in favor of this bill?

APRIL 11, 1957

Nicholas J. Spellman, Legislative Council: I am appearing here for Mr. Harry Lugg, Director, who was unable to be here. As a result of our study and as a result of our consultation with the fire marshal's office and with Captain Shaw, we were pretty well impressed with the fact there needed to be changes in the statutes. We drew up this bill in cooperation with Captain Shaw which we think will meet with requirements. We found in the statutes that the word "fire-proof" was being misconstrued and misused in relation to construction, and we have substituted the word "non-combustible" -- meaning that materials are fire-resistant, and we have taken the word "fire-proof" out of the statutes.

I am sure Captain Shaw can explain this better than I, and you can put any questions to him. I wish to add that the members of the Council are in favor of this bill, and I hope it receives a favorable report.

Carroll E. Shaw, Captain of State Police, State Fire Marshal's Office: I am authorized by Commissioner Kelly to register the department's approval of this bill and to make myself available to any questions you might have. I won't go through the bill section by section, as it is pretty lengthy, but I am sure you will have some questions. I do feel that I should call to the Committee's attention, however, that under the provisions of 4097, the commissioner of labor may when making inspections order fire escapes in buildings used for manufacturing purposes because presently under consideration by the Legislature is a bill changing the authority for writing fire safety regulations from the department of labor to the department of state police. If this is passed and the state fire marshal is to write the regulations for factories, then this bill would in conflict.

Chm. Prokop: Are there any questions of Captain Shaw?

Rep. Ratkiewich: On inspections by local fire marshals, they don't give any o.k. to the owner of a tenement house -- they just record it in writing in their own tongue?

Captain Shaw: Connecticut does not have an adequate tenement housing act. The purpose of this bill is to correct that.

APRIL 11, 1957

Rep. Ratkiewich: With regard to inspectors making a monthly report, it doesn't say anything about telling the apartment or tenement owner whether everything is o.k. or not at that time. Don't you think they should get some sort of notification if something is wrong? How would they know if everything is alright. A lot of times there are absentee owners.

Captain Shaw: Generally speaking, fire marshals make it their business to notify owners.

Rep. Ratkiewich: But the absentee owner doesn't know.

Rep. Draper: You remember the other three bills we have under consideration. What I am trying to find out for our own clarification, is this the one you would prefer to have?

Captain Shaw: This is an important bill, of course, but the bill amending Section 3665 authorizing the state fire marshall to write regulations for all. As it is now it exempts factories.

Thomas J. Collins, Chief, New Haven Fire Department: I came up here to plead for the enactment of this bill as it would strengthen inspection departments of cities. Captain Shaw spoke about this other bill. I think I spoke on that at the other hearing. We wish to register approval of this bill.

Chief James L. Grote, local fire marshal, Chester, Connecticut, and representing Connecticut Fire Chiefs Association. I would like to register in favor of this bill, S.B. No. 635. Answering the gentleman in the corner (Rep. Ratkiewich) as an old fire marshal, if we make an inspection, if something is wrong or whether it is o.k., we leave no doubt in anyone's mind.

Patrick Sherwin, President of the Connecticut State Firemen's Association. Of the 26,000 men in the fire service, both volunteer and paid men, I want to put them on record as in support of this bill.

Leonard Kirshner, Legislative Chairman, Connecticut State Firemen's Association: I, too, would like to go on record in favor of this bill and put our organization on record. We are very pleased to have an opportunity today to speak in behalf of a bill that directly benefits the public. The Legislative Council has given a great deal of time, thought and study, they have deliberated long over this thing, and very carefully, and brought the code up to date as is needed with the advent of the high chemical and perhaps atomic age. We urge a favorable report.

George F. Kennedy, Chief of Fire Marshals, City of Hartford: I speak for myself and for Chief Thomas, of the Hartford Fire Department, in favor of S.B. No. 635.

Clifton Clark, Building Inspector, Town of Windsor, and I am speaking as representative of the Building Inspectors Association. We would like to go on record in favor of this bill. We feel it will provide a more effective administration of fire prevention measures. There are two suggestions that I would like to make which I hope the Committee will consider: (1) If you will refer to Page 7, Section 10, as it reads now "each city may make ordinances." I would like to suggest that you include town, so it would read "each town or city may make ordinances..." And, down at the bottom of the page where it says "appointment of an inspector of buildings." I would suggest that it state: "appointment of a qualified inspector of buildings as set forth in Section 4108. In the next line where it states "no such ordinance or rule shall be in conflict..." That concerns regulations adopted by the town and I just wondered that possibly some town might adopt a requirement which would be more restrictive than the proposal of the state fire marshal's office, and it might be in conflict. I thought if "in conflict" was just deleted, so it would read "no such ordinance or rule shall be more restrictive than the state fire marshal's office."

Captain Shaw: I have no objection the the suggestions outlined by Mr. Clark with the possible exception of the deletion of the word "in conflict" because that's the terminology of the Legislative Council and I would advise that we go by their terminology.

APRIL 11, 1957

Mr. Clark: The only reason I raised the question was because I thought that if a town should adopt a requirement that was more restrictive than those proposed by the state, someone might contend they were in conflict with them.

Chm. Prokop: We'll take that into consideration when we are considering the bill. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in favor of this bill? Is there anyone in opposition? No opposition. Then, the hearing is closed.