

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-329		1721	0	4	2
<u>Committee Pages:</u>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3077-3080 	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1711-1712

H-114

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 7
3011-3376**

Tuesday, May 18, 1971

67

the Probate Reform Act of 1967. The primary purpose of this bill is to merely rectify the overassessments of accounts receivable earned by probate judges prior to January 1, 1968. The Probate Court Administrator has construed the present statute to require the assessment of these receivables received by the judge even though they were earned before the date of the reformat. This bill directs the Administrator to permit a judge to take a deduction on his assessment return for an amount equal to the receivables on his books on January 1, 1968 as well as for the repayment to the judge for any of his cash or other property advanced to the court prior to that date. This bill requires no state money. It requires no appropriation. It's a good bill and I urge it's passage.

djh

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill? If not, the question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. All those in favor will indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The bill is PASSED.

THE CLERK:

Bottom of page 11, Calendar No. 973, S.B. No. 1721, An Act Concerning Local Appropriations to Drug Abuse Organizations.

MRS. YACAVONE (17th):

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The question is on acceptance and passage in concurrence. Will you remark?

MRS. YACAVONE (17th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. This bill permits town, city or borough of Connecticut to make an appropriation for assistance to a non-profit organization

Tuesday, May 18, 1971

68

djh

concerned with the fight against drug abuse and drug dependency. The services provided by the organization must be made available to the residents of the local community. If this bill sounds familiar, I think we passed one quite similar to it but I bow to the superior authorities who say this is a better bill and I urge it's passage.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill?

MR. NEVAS (144th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise too to support this bill despite the fact that the bill to which the lady referred that we passed on May 10th, which you'll find in your files as File 722, was introduced by Rep. Stroffolino and myself at the request of a number of organizations in Fairfield County. Apparently someone on the other side of the aisle in the Senate decided that this was something that they wanted to do so the bill now comes back to us as a Senate bill. But, despite that, I'm in favor of it and I urge it's passage.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill?

MR. SARASIN (95th):

Mr. Speaker, I urge wholehearted support for this bill but I have a problem. In line 6, in understanding the bill I have a problem, in line 6, the language of the bill says in such municipality and my question is and perhaps it can be cured by legislative intent if in fact it is a problem, my question is, does this mean that a municipality may provide money for an organization as defined in the bill only if the organization is located in the municipality? And I would ask that question of the proponent of the bill.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Does the lady from the 17th care to respond?

Tuesday, May 18, 1971

69

MRS. YACAVONE (17th):

Mr. Speaker, through you, my understanding that it definitely applies to the municipality in question, no other municipality. If someone has further knowledge, I'd be glad to hear about it.

MR. SARASIN (95th):

Mr. Speaker, in view of the limited nature of the bill and in particular, particularly rather in the area from which I come and represent, Day Top is located in the Town of Seymour and I think if the towns surrounding the town of Seymour were able to come under the provisions of this bill and if they so desired to provide money for the maintenance of the Day Top organization, that it would indeed be a fine thing. The facility is available for the residents of the communities in the area. But we're telling communities, like Ansonia for example that does not have a drug rehabilitation or treatment center that they may not provide money if they were inclined to this organization which in fact provides them a service. I wonder if that is the intent that the organization has to be in the municipality that perhaps it shouldn't be expanded. I would, as I understand, this being the Senate bill, as I understand File 772 which we've already passed, we did not have that problem. It's not file 772, 722. Because of this purely restrictive nature, I frankly would reluctantly I suppose be opposed the bill. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I'm a little bit confused.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill?

MRS. YACAVONE (17th):

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure but I would think if a municipality wanted to contribute to such an organization as Day Top, they would be allowed to do this. Very often these major centers, like Day Top, from smaller programs such

djh

Tuesday, May 18, 1971

70

the induction center, such as Narco, within other towns. So if this is the intent, I think this is good.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill?

MR. OLIVER (104th):

Mr. Speaker, amplification of Mr. Sarasin's point, it would appear that the phrase "in such municipality" modifies, refers to the nouns abuse and dependency in lines 5 and 6, not to the word "organization" in line 3 and so I think that corrects his problem and I think it means it can be an organization in another town conducting programs in one or more towns as long as part of the program is aimed at drug abuse and dependency in such municipality making this appropriation or grant.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further? If not, the question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence. All those in favor will indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The bill is PASSED.

MR. HANNON (16th):

I wonder if we might return to the bottom of page 9, to Calendar No. 952.

THE CLERK:

Is that File No. 1003?

MR. HANNON (16th):

That's exactly what it is, sir.

THE CLERK:

H.B. No. 8692.

djh

S-79

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 4
1457-1920**

May 11, 1971

25.

committee on Public Health and Safety on S.B.1721 An Act Concerning Local Appropriations to Drug Abuse Organizations.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Pac.

SENATOR PAC.

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR PAC.

This is permissive legislation. It would permit any municipality to make grants to any non-profit organization that provides drug abuse programs. It seems that some of these towns have legal impediments that prevent them from making these grants. In the absence of authority of a legal statutes. Currently there are some towns that do make them and I think that if we expanded it perhaps more towns would get into the act.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

Senator Rimer.

SENATOR RIMER:

Mr. President, make the record note that I identify myself with the remarks of Senator Pac in favor of this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not all those in favor of

May 11, 1971

26.

passage, signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CHAIR:

May the item the Clerk is just about to announce be held. There has been a little discussion since I reported to you before.

THE CHAIR:

There being no objection it will pass retaining place.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 596, File 807, Favorable report joint standing committee on Judiciary on S.B. 1311. An Act Concerning the Revision of Estate to Spouse.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Jackson.

SENATOR JACKSON:

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

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, this is a very good bill. Which adds the words for her to Sec. 46-22A of the General Statutes. The effect of this Amendment will mean that the man deriving property as result of love or affection or as a result of the marriage would be given the property as well as the woman under appropriate circumstances. I urge the adoption of this bill.