

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SB924

PA 606

1957

House: P. 3508

Senate: P. 3659-3660

General law: P. 665-679

LAW/LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
DO NOT REMOVE FROM LIBRARY

18 PAGES

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

Connecticut State Library  
Compiled 2015

H-35

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY

HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1957

VOL. 7  
PART 6  
2923-3519

Monday, June 3, 1957

VH HV  
L-8 -122

THE CLERK: Cal. No. 1971, file 1448. Sub. for SB 924. An Act concerning the Solicitation of Cases by or for an Attorney at Law. Favorable report of committee on General Law.

MR. AUGUST (AVONE): I move for acceptance in concurrence with the Senate.

THE SPEAKER: Question is on acceptance and passage in concurrence. Will you remark?

MR. AUGUST (AVON): This bill places in statutory form what is presently substantially one of the ethics of the Bar Association. It provides a penalty for any person who pays another person for soliciting cases for an attorney, and in section 2 it provides a penalty for any person who receives any money or other thing of value in procuring a case for an attorney. It was spoken in favor of at the hearing before the committee by numerous outstanding attorneys in the state, including David Goldstein, past president of the State Bar Association, and Atty. George Sadin of Bridgeport, and several others. It was opposed by only one attorney. It's a good bill and I hope it passes.

THE SPEAKER:

Will you remark further? Question is on acceptance in concurrence with the Senate. All in favor, signify by usual sign, contrary, bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Cal. No. 1972, file 1440. SB 1073. An Act validating a Ded given by Edwyn Poor and Pauline Poor to Florence Gotthold. Favorable report of General Law.

MR. AUGUST (AVON): I move for acceptance and passage in concurrence.

S-26

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1957

VOL. 7  
PART 6  
3224-3761

MAY 29, 1957

40

Question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and adoption of the resolution. Will you remark?

SENATOR SNYDER:

Mr. President, this bill gives the subject matter of House Bill 999 establishing a new town of Wequonnoc over to the Legislative Council for study in the next two years and report to the 1959 assembly. I move the passage of the resolution.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and adoption of the resolution. All those in favor say AYE, opposed? The report is accepted and the resolution adopted.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 1521. File 1448. Sub. for Senate Bill 924. An act concerning the solicitation of cases by or for an attorney at law. Favorable report, General Law.

THE CHAIR:

The Senator from the 12th.

SENATOR FILER:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Will you remark?

SENATOR FILER:

Mr. President, this bill would make unlawful what is commonly termed ambulance chasing by or on behalf of an attorney

MAY 29, 1957

4.

and paying something of value for that service. This is a violation of the canons of ethics but there is no statute which prohibits the individual runner from bringing cases to an attorney. This would it unlawful for an attorney to pay someone to render this service or anyone to accept the service. However, we feel the bill is so drafted that it will protect people who refer matters to attorneys innocently without intention of violating the statute.

THE PRESIDENT PRESIDING

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not, all those in favor will signify by saying AYE, opposed NO. The report is accepted and the bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 1522. File 1447. Senate Bill 237. An act concerning examinations of veterans for admission to the bar. Favorable report, Judiciary and Governmental Functions.

THE CHAIR:

The Senator from the 26th.

SENATOR SIBAL:

Mr. President, I move for acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on acceptance of the committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Will you remark?

SENATOR SIBAL:

This bill amends an act passed by the '55 session

JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS

GENERAL LAW  
PART 2  
PAGES 378-789

CONN  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY  
1957

SPECIAL SESSION  
MARCH 1958

CONNECTICUT  
STATE LIBRARY

Atty. Gleason: (Continued) with them by Mr. Becker well within the statutory period, however.

There is some question in my mind as to just who is responsible for the maintenance of this sidewalk. In some of our towns, these problems exist. The town disclaims any control over the sidewalks; the state highway feel that they are responsible for the maintenance of the traveled portion of the highway, but not the sidewalks; and the adjoining land owner who actually owns the land, but claims no responsibility for the sidewalks, leaves with three possibilities for Mr. Becker, but no knowledge exists where he is going to wind up.

It seems to me that it would be a very fair thing if he was permitted to cite in the state and the town and allow this evidence to be presented to the court on the question of liability for this defect. There is no question there was one there and it had been there for a long time. He was injured by it and he should be entitled to his day in court.

I'll be glad to speak with the State Highway representative and any consideration the Committee would give this will be very much appreciated.

Rep. August: Thank you, Mr. Gleason. Is there anyone else to be heard either in favor of or opposed to this bill?

If not, we will commence the hearing on those bills scheduled for 11:30 by starting with S. B. 924.

S. B. 924 (Sen. Shannon) AN ACT CONCERNING THE SOLICITATION OF CASES BY OR FOR AN ATTORNEY AT LAW.

Is there anyone here at this time who wants to be heard on that bill? We have a note here that there are two or three attorneys who are on their way here to also discuss the bill. You gentlemen are free now to speak if you wish or if you want to, we can wait and hear everyone at the same time.

We will open the hearing then on S. B. 924.

Atty. Charles Henschel, New Haven: I was not aware of this bill until I arrived here this morning. I know we had a very thorough rundown of the numbers of bills of interest to the legal profession at a couple of our Bar meetings in New Haven. I don't recall this bill as having been brought to our attention. I do want to register in favor of this bill unequivocally.

I know that things might be said that might result in what might be considered unfavorable news publicity, so therefore I am going to be careful of what I say. Because I know nothing that I can authenticate.

On the other hand, there are considerable rumors in my community and I daresay everywhere else. I recall only too vividly the investigation that took place in New Haven County back in the '30s.

While our Cannon of Ethics should do the job that this legislation purports to do, I think this is a little bit more far-reaching as it would make not only the attorney but the person he might use liable to this criminal penalty. I don't like to see legislation of this sort on the books because I don't think that lawyers should be required to have penal statutes hanging over their heads to compel them to carry on their practices properly.

But I do think, without going into detail, that at this time there is a need for this legislation. I would urge its passage.

Atty. George A. Sadin, Bridgeport: S. B. 924 with some slight revision of language deserves to become law, as I see it.

Much talk has been batted back and forth among lawyers and, in fact, among judges concerning the vice of ambulance-chasing indulged in by a group of attorneys particularly in the larger communities. The impression one gets is that the situation is becoming progressively worse. Of course it relates itself mainly to the field of negligence practice and particularly to the field of automobile accidents.

The existence of ambulance-chasing among lawyers is a clear manifestation of total disregard of the ethical standards of the legal profession.

Atty. Sadin: (Continued) The law has become a business with the ambulance-chaser and it is no longer a profession. Concentration is placed upon the volume of business, the fast dollar, so-called, and the client takes the hind votes, if any can be found.

Generally speaking, ambulance-chasers have no innate devotion to a client's cause and welfare. Those elements are incidental to the chase and purpose. Ambulance-chasing has brought disgrace upon the ethical members of the Bar. It has placed all lawyers in the same shadow. It is concentrated in many instances in abnormal number of automobile accident cases where they normally would not go in the hands of the least able and experienced attorney, usually to the detriment of the client.

The attorney's right to practice must not be permitted in the hands of the ambulance-chaser to become a license to prey upon the public.

Of course, this bill is not the whole answer to the problem anymore than the statutes against murder and robbery are the whole answer against those offenses. But I think it is fair to say that the bill before you will have a salutary effect. It will tend to retard, at least, the ever increasing fever of ambulance-chasing.

I think it is time that the Bar appraised its own members and require them all, without exception, to abide by the Canons of Professional Ethics or remove themselves as members of the Bar.

There are, of course, additional means of insuring a higher caliber of ethics among all lawyers, which need not be discussed here today.

The present bill, to a large extent, is modeled after Section 28 of the Canons of Professional Ethics. There has been some talk and consideration given to incorporating into statutory law most or all of these Canons, but we are not called upon to decide these questions today.

We are striking now at one of the major causes of the debasement of the legal profession, so-called ambulance-chasing. This bill will make it a criminal offense for policemen, court or prison official, hospital attachees, automobile repair men, towers, wreckers and all the others

Atty. Sadin: (Continued) to solicit cases for certain lawyers. It will make it a criminal offense for a lawyer to employ such persons. It will not, however, affect the normal method available to lawyers to obtain clients, namely, through friendly, legitimate recommendations without compensation, and through the lawyer's own ability. It will permit direct action by a State's Attorney without necessarily waiting for recommendations from the Grievance Committee.

In conclusion, I am authorized to state on behalf of the Bridgeport Bar Association President, Theodore L. Kotler, that the Bridgeport Bar endorses this bill and its underlying purpose.

I am also authorized to say on behalf of the State's Attorney for Fairfield County, Loren W. Willis, that he is in favor of legislation which will make ambulance-chasing a criminal offense, both for the lawyer embracing its methods and for the runners who are such a lawyer's instruments.

I have already discussed this matter with the State's Attorney for New London County, Allen L. Brown, Jr., who recommends that the maximum penalty be made three years instead of one in order to make extradition available as a means of enforcing the law, if that should become necessary. I think the bill should be so amended.

I trust the Committee will see fit to enter a favorable report on this bill with a few minor revisions of wording, but I'll be glad to sit with the Committee later today. Thank you.

Sen. Filer: Do you feel that if this bill is enacted as a statute that it would have a substantial effect because the enforcement would be in the hands of the State's Attorneys and more legitimate channels where they are used to investigating and practice criminal prosecution? Do you think it will make a substantial difference?

Atty. Sadin: Yes, I think it will, Mr. Chairman. I think that once the fellows who are in the automobile wrecking business, for example, policemen who are riding in some of the automobile investigation cars, are aware of the fact that there is actually a statute on the books which makes it a criminal offense to accept money or remuneration in any form for chasing cases. It will help to

Atty. Sadin: (Continued) retard the situation that ambulance-chasing does involve.

I must say this. This is only one step in the process. I have already prepared a bill which I hope one of the Committees will see fit to raise and set down for public hearing, which would revamp the Grievance Committee Procedures and which would put a judge of the Superior Court on these committees and give it a little more backbone.

This isn't the whole answer, Mr. Chairman, but I do think that once it becomes a crime as this statute makes it, you've got an entirely different situation from simply having it a standard of ethics to be enforced by Grievance Committees which are themselves not too well set up to take care of the situation. You are dealing with practicing attorneys trying to adjudge other practicing attorneys.

Rep. August: Do you think that the Grievance Committee or the operations of the Grievance Committee should be on the level of the State Bar Association rather than on the County Bar Association?

Atty. Sadin: The proposed bill which I have on my desk now provides for a County Bar Grievance Committee and a State-wide Grievance Committee. This is really a combination of an idea which was suggested to me by Allyn L. Brown, the State Attorney for New London County. The County Bar would have 3 members on it, one of whom would be a judge of the Superior Court, and they would ~~ask~~ act as a Grievance Committee for the State-wide Bar Committee. The State-wide Committee would have one member from each county and one judge of the Superior Court, not necessarily from any particular county.

I think that procedure would tend to give a more realistic appraisal of complaints that come before Grievance Committees. I think it would make some of these lawyers who are doing the wrong thing sit up and take some notice.

Sen. Filer: Is this not true also - that the bill would affect not only the attorney, but the individual who brings the case to the attorney, and they are the people who are not within our Canons of Ethics. We can't disbar a tow-truck operator.

Atty. Sadin: That's a very pertinent observation, Mr. Chairman. It is one of the real reasons for the enactment

Atty. Sadin: (Continued) of this kind of legislation. I might say that I received a call earlier from Attorney David Goldstein, a former president of the State Bar Association in Bridgeport, who is on his way here now and expects to be here about noon and would like to speak on this bill.

I believe he will have with him Attorney Adrien Mahr, formerly U. S. Attorney for the State of Connecticut. I believe both of these gentlemen will speak on this bill.

Rep. August: There are others planning to come in and we will hear them at the end of the bills scheduled, of which there are not a great number. Probably, that will be somewhere after 12.

Is there anyone else to be heard at this time on S. B. 924?

Rep. Marie Bouteiller, Middletown: I would like to go on record as being in favor of S. B. 924. Thank you.

Rep. August: Is there anyone opposed to this bill?

Atty. Morton Cole, Hartford: This bill has a lot of good features and it has a lot of bad features and dangerous ones. I don't think anyone could complain about the second portion of Section 2 of the bill which makes it a crime for anybody to receive any money for bringing a case to an attorney. No reputable attorney will pay anybody or want anybody to bring him business for which they have to pay that person directly or indirectly.

But I want your Committee to consider the fact that there are attorneys in this particular chamber at the present time which under the first section of this bill might be committing a crime unintentionally, let's say. I think that of the hundreds, if not thousands, of accident cases handled by our office, I don't know of one that was ever referred to by a policeman. And I can understand that maybe in other counties, that might have occurred. I think even in Hartford where a policeman has referred a case to certain firms without pay simply because that particular attorney happens to be a good attorney for the job, I don't think that policeman should be penalized.

I know that the bill mentions the term "payment", but it says indirectly or directly. I don't

Atty. Cole: (Continued) want to mention one of the gentlemen that is here by name, but he does represent a very powerful religious organization in the county. Now there is nothing wrong whatsoever with any member of a religious organization recommending cases to that attorney; regardless of what I may personally think about that attorney, he is a capable attorney, and I think he does a good job for his clients and an honest one.

Now the question is, supposing that that attorney, out of the charity and goodness of his heart and his duty as an attorney, not simply to do things for remuneration, does something for that organization. Are you then going to say that the members of that religious organization are committing a crime or ever intend to or that that attorney is? It would be ridiculous, so to contend, and yet under the wording of this section 1, it is very well that it could be so interpreted.

I don't say that there is anything wrong with the idea of penalizing anybody that does anything wrong, but the Grievance Comittess in the various counties know what they are doing. They have the authority to do it and when you stop to figure it out, it is a greater punishment to an attorney to lose his live lhood if he engages in ambulance-chasing, so-called. I want to tell you something if I may.

I don't know Mr. Sadin, but I never heard of a thing that was propounded that so resembles the propaganda of certain cliques of insurance companies in this country that a client who impugnes upon the integrity of the Bar and of the attorney.

Let me make another instance. We in Hartford, I don't think I have ever heard of a case of real ambulance-chasing in my over 30 years of practice. That may seem strange, but the best proof of it is that cases come to attorneys several months after the accident and during the investigation of such a case, you find that there has been no attempt to approach that particular client. That's the best indication that there isn't any such thing as ambulance-chasing in Hartford County. I cannot speak of New Haven or Bridgeport or Stamford because I don't know enough of the county, but certainly if they have such a situation there, those counties can well afford to take care of themselves.

Atty. Cole: (Continued)

Again I say that the way this bill is phrased in Section 1 and Section 2, it is a double-barreled gun. You have two horses and you have got to make up your mind which one you are going to ride.

I don't want to be long and I think I have spoken long enough, but just consider the danger of whoever drafted this bill. It says "who remunerates in any manner" those who induced any person to bring cases or even to seek his professional services. Take a hypothetical instance. Do you mean to say that a priest or minister or rabbi shouldn't be allowed to say to a person who approaches him, well I think you ought to go up and see attorney so-and-so? He may be of assistance to you.

Supposing that attorney so-and-so, he has a right to charge, but he doesn't charge. Possibly that would be no cause for calling him guilty of a crime; supposing he did charge that person a reasonable fee which is his right. Are you going to say then that he is committing a crime? It isn't right. I say certainly the bill is bad as far as Section 1. The idea is good but the way it is written up is bad.

Section 2, I think that is a good idea. That would stop anybody from around police courts and we don't handle these, I don't think I have been down in Police Court for years, but certainly this would prevent a bad situation from developing if there was any cause for it. But we don't get it in Connecticut like they do in New York City and other places. Thank you.

Rep. August: Thank you, Mr. Cole. There has been a question. If you would care to answer it, Mr. Tilson. Has the State Bar Association taken any position on this? You don't have to answer it if you haven't proposed to make a statement.

John Tilson: I was not going to say anything because the State Bar Association was somewhat divided on this point and took no official position on it. I can point out that a number of the people felt that the Canon of Ethics were sufficient and they didn't like to see legislation of this kind on the books. On the other hand, people felt in the meeting at which it was discussed that we ought to be the first to stand up if there is ambulance-chasing, we are definitely

Mr. Tilson: (Continued) opposed to it.

The answer to your question is, no we have not taken a stand on it.

Rep. August: Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard on S.B. 924?

Sen. Barringer, 32nd District: I hate to feel that it is necessary to come in and speak for a bill of this sort because I must assume that this practice is non-existent. Yet, if it should be existent, I would think that the bill should very surely pass.

We had a bill almost like this at the last session, I believe before the Judiciary Committee. And for one reason or another, it failed. It should not have failed and it should not fail this time.

I particularly like Section 2 which makes it somewhat unhealthy for those people who would cooperate if there is any cooperation with the members of the Bar and making it rather hot for them to make a profit out of the situation. I presume that you as a Committee might take judicial notice that in other states at least, it occasionally happens as resulting from that article in the Saturday Evening Post of how to really make dough in a big way.

I must make the assumption that it never happens in the State of Connecticut, but by the same token, there is no reason why this type of prohibition should not be passed as an affirmation by the Legislative Body that this is thoroughly wrong and thoroughly improper. I can't see why any member of the Bar would dare to oppose it, on any grounds because if there is one thing, if it does exist, that should be frowned upon for the benefit of our profession is this very matter.

I can't tell you how strongly I feel about it. I believe that the Bar Association tries to police our own group on this and as I say, I know of no cases of my own personal knowledge where it exists. I hope and trust that it doesn't exist. But this is one bill, Mr. Chairman, that should go through and it makes it a two-way street. The person who really profits out of this, the runner, also has a little retardation. It is too bad it isn't

Sen. Barringer: (Continued) \$5,000 and 5 years in the can. That's where they belong. They are scum and they always will be scum. It is about time that we put the scum in the can where they belong.

Attorney Brennan, representing Bridgeport Bar Association: We have gone on record as being in favor of this bill.

I think I ought to call some matters to your attention when you are considering this bill because it does raise one problem. First, let me say that there are such practices going on and that it isn't the lawyers who are being injured nearly so much as it is the general public, people who are seeking relief, who are being injured by the practice. They find themselves generally in the hands of incompetent and incapable lawyers because the competent and capable lawyer has dignity enough to avoid such practices and sense of character enough to avoid such practices.

The practices are going on and the misfortune of it - I am chairman of the Ethics Committee of our Bridgeport Bar - and the misfortune of it is that when a young man enters the Bar, he sees a group of lawyers financially successful because they have been able to get the business through illegal and improper means and after a year or two of starvation, decides that maybe he ought to go that way too. That is too bad.

I have one concern and that is about Section<sup>1</sup> of this bill. I am not trying to leave any stop-gap or safeguard for the lawyer. But the Grievance Committee has been considering these matters and the Ethics Committees have been considering these matters. One of the problems that has not yet been determined is and will probably have to be determined by some court, is whether or not a lawyer in appearing before a Grievance Committee loses his right to practice law, can have his right to practice law taken away from him if he pleads the Fifth Amendment in regard to questions asked concerning solicitations, ambulance-chasing, etc.

There is considerable dispute in my own Committee and in the Grievance Committee of Fairfield County as to whether or not that right is available to him. I personally believe that no lawyer under present circumstances has a right to appear

Atty. Brennan: (Continued) before a properly authorized Committee and plead the Fifth Amendment and retain his right to practice law. However, that is only a personal belief.

If this law passes on Section 1, I am afraid that my opinion would have to be to the contrary since we then have him charged with a criminal statute and he would have the right to take advantage of the fifth Amendment in refusing to answer questions because they might be to his incrimination before the criminal courts and that might jeopardize this formal proceedings against him.

On Section 2, from my own experience, I say that its enactment is absolutely necessary. It is one of the great difficulties in this thing and there is no question that it is the lawyer that is the offender and not the people who assist, and they are only the small potatoes in this. But nevertheless, one of the principal things that is in this is that you have no authority over the so-called runner, no authority over the person who receives a fee, and no ability to get any kind of cooperation between him and any authorized committee. Such a criminal procedure against him might well result in such cooperation.

Sen. John Shannon, Bridgeport: Without taking too much more of the Committee's time, I am the sponsor of S. B. 924 and I do want to go on record as being in favor of it.

I didn't hear all of Mr. Brennan's remarks but those I heard, I certainly concur with. I talked with Senator Barringer and he has suggested the penalty be increased. As far as I am concerned, that is up to the Committee to decide. I think the bill as written is sufficient. If the Committee feels it necessary to increase it, that's all right.

I would also like to leave one thought with you. It certainly is a sad day for the profession in the State of Connecticut when we have to come to our Legislature with this type of bill. I am not completely familiar with the practice throughout the State. I am fairly acquainted in Fairfield County, more particularly metropolitan Bridgeport and I am sorry to have to report to the Committee that this type of legislation is necessary in our area. Not only is this type of legislation necessary, but strict and

Sen. Shannon: (Continued) vigorous enforcement is also necessary in order to bring back to the profession the standards which we all would like to see.

Rep. Turner: Mr. Cole, I have a question to ask you. You see, I am not a lawyer. You selected in Section 1, "who pays or awards any person directly or indirectly" and you characterized Section 1 as bad, the penalty being levied against lawyers. Section 2, we have the repetition of the same phraseology, "payment directly or indirectly" and this is levied against what the previous gentlemen characterized as being small potatoes. How do you differentiate between lawyers and small potatoes in the penalty?

Atty. Cole: I didn't intend to differentiate between them at all. What I said was that the way Section 1 is set up, it is a bad bill. I don't think I or any other attorney would object to a bill which categorically, clearly, expressly, distinctly and any other way that I can describe adjectively, statement that says no attorney shall pay or reward any person or employ any runners or any agents to obtain business for him, of any nature whatsoever. But that isn't what this section says.

If this Section 2 were even redrafted a little bit more explicitly and said any person who makes it his business or even without making it his business receives pay from any attorney has committed a crime for which he should receive certain punishment, I could see it.

That is what these gentlemen from the Bridgeport Bar are trying to tell you, but they are not telling it to you when they say that this bill on the face of it is good. That's what I am pointing out.

You cannot punish the man, the runner, whether he is an insurance adjuster working for an insurance company, and I say that because I have heard of instances where they have referred matters to attorneys. I don't say that they did it wrongly because I don't know whether he got paid or not. But supposing that that insurance adjuster actually thought that a firm was a better firm than another. Would you say he is wrong in recommending him? That would be against all principles because after all, every person should have a right and it should not be a crime to express your opinion of what you think of the

Atty. Cole: (Continued) ability of either a doctor or a lawyer, an insurance agent or anyone who is engaged in making a livelihood. That isn't what these bills show. They don't indicate them.

I said and I want to point it out again - look at this bill. It says any attorney who shall reward or remunerate in any manner - anybody who induces people to seek the services of such attorney or to seek his professional service. So I say, supposing you are selling insurance and you are selling insurance to that lawyer. I gave you a hypothetical example and the lawyer buys insurance from you. You say, well he has been good to me, I am going to recommend so-and-so, also a client of his, who was in an automobile accident to go to see that attorney or to go to see a certain doctor that he, himself, felt has gone and done him a good turn by treating him well. Would you say that that insurance agent was committing a crime?

Under the way Section 1 is set up, I think it may reasonably be inferred that that insurance agent, in the hope of profit and that is a form of remuneration, is guilty of a crime. I don't think that is what this bill intends to do is to make that insurance agent a criminal.

I take the example of a priest conducting a small parish house. He finds and he honestly feels that a certain attorney has rendered a lot of services for that parish house. So, when a child in that parish is injured in an accident, he suggests to the parents of that child in language somewhat like this - well, Mr. Thomas Smith or Joe O'Brien have been very good to the parish house and they are good lawyers. They've rendered a lot of services free to the parish house. I suggest that you go and see them. Or they have been good in giving a good sized contribution to the repairing of the parish house. Do you want this parish priest to be considered guilty of a crime? I don't think so. I don't think anybody so intends, but that is what Section 1 does.

I say if you want to have a law like it and if these attorneys from the Bridgeport Bar, and I am not criticizing the Bridgeport Bar, feel that their house needs some cleaning, they are well capable of doing it. If this gentlemen who is down here from the Grievance Committee feels that his authority isn't sufficient, then

Atty. Cole: (Continued) he hasn't looked up his authority because every member of the Grievance Committee and the Grievance Committee itself is an arm of function of the Superior Court and they have a great deal of authority - much more than simply a \$1,000 fine.

I don't know of any attorney in Connecticut who would give up his business for a \$10,000 fine. There is no sense to saying it is \$1,000 for an attorney. I think you ought to make it \$50,000 fine if he is going to be deprived of his livelihood, rather, if he isn't going to be. Just think of what is over his head now. He can be deprived of that livelihood. I don't think the average attorney starting would sell it for \$10,000 or \$50,000. I am just asking you to be practical on this.

I am neither for nor opposed to the idea of this bill. I think we have ample machinery for carrying out the purposes of Section 1. Now we don't have as far as Section 2 is concerned. That's true. There is no way of getting to the ambulance-chaser and I say that we should have a bill that is strong enough for it. I don't think - I think \$1,000 is enough - because I don't think any man that would undertake such a degrading work. It doesn't clearly put it down in express language. I want to get the man out from under any criticism that honestly recommends a case, whether he be minister, rabbi, priest, or anyone else in the community.

David Goldstein, Bridgeport: I can see no harm in the passage of this bill. I just heard the gentleman who spoke against the passage of the bill complain about the effect of it. It won't hurt. This bill has been designed and properly drawn for the purpose of eliminating individuals from procuring business through the payment of sums of money. I don't think it could be drastic enough or too drastic to deal with men, whether they be lawyers, garage men. I see no reason why anyone should complain about the nature of this bill.

It will only effect those lawyers who are doing things that they should not be doing and it will only effect garagemen, other individuals, who are receiving remuneration from lawyers which they should not be receiving.

It is very unfair to permit one group of lawyers to indulge in this type of practice to the

Atty. Goldstein: (Continued) detriment of the Bar, the members of the Bar, young and old, who are endeavoring to live up to the highest tradition of the Bar.

I think this bill is an excellent bill and should be passed and receive favorable consideration by your Committee.

Adriam W. Maher, Practicing lawyer in Bridgeport: I have been practicing for 29 years and I heartily endorse this bill as it clearly indicates from a reading of it that it only has to do with the illegitimate references by people who are in a position to send accident cases to lawyers.

Any ethical member of the Bar, I think, would support this bill. As I read it, if Jones, a friend, should say to a practicing lawyer that you should go to this lawyer, that's perfectly all right. What this bill as I read it indicates is wrong is when there is a remuneration, something that is derogatory not only to the Bar but to the persons who are making a practice of it and getting gain for doing it.

I am happy to be here in support of this bill and I think the bill should receive the favorable consideration of this Committee.

Rep. August: Thank you, sir. Is there anyone else to be heard on S.B. 924? If not, we will proceed to the hearing on the next three bills and anyone wishing to speak on any of them may speak on all of them. You may do so at one time.

H.B. 1786 (Rep. Gersten, by request) AN ACT CONCERNING NEGLIGENCE SUITS AGAINST CHARITABLE CORPORATION.

H. B. 1390 (Rep. Winnick) AN ACT CONCERNING LIABILITY OF CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

S. B. 387 (Senator Drutman) AN ACT CONCERNING LIABILITY OF CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

Is there anyone in favor of any of those three bills?

Is there anyone opposed to any of those three bills?

Joseph Cooney, Association of Casualty Companies: I want to point out that we take no position on the question of whether or not this body should repeal the charitable immunities since that is