

<b>Act Number</b>	<b>Session</b>	<b>Bill Number</b>	<b>Total Number of Committee Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of House Pages</b>	<b>Total Number of Senate Pages</b>
PA 71-330		1311	2	1	2
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judiciary 476-477</li> </ul>				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3018(Consent)</li> </ul>	<u>Senate Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1712-1713</li> </ul>

**H-114**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

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

Tuesday, May 18, 1971

8

Connecticut Board of Examiners of Midwives and the Transfer of its Powers, File No. 986; Calendar No. 0942, substitute for H.B. No. 5202, An Act Concerning the Establishment of Maximum Noise Levels to Control Noise Generated by Vehicles, File No. 982; Calendar No. 0944, substitute for H.B. No. 5874. An Act Concerning Medical Treatment for Injured Workers, File No. 998; Calendar No. 0947, substitute for H.B. No. 6613, An Act Concerning Savings Bank Time Deposits, File No. 1002; Calendar No. 0949, substitute for H.B. No. 7428, An Act Concerning Cost-of-Living Adjustments to Beneficiaries Entitled to Workmen's Compensation Death Benefits, File No. 1015; Calendar No. 0969, substitute for S.B. No. 0464, An Act Concerning the Merger or Consolidation of State Banks and Trust Companies, File No. 709; Calendar No. 0970, Substitute for S.B. No. 1311, An Act Concerning the Reversion of Estate to Spouse, File No. 807; Calendar No. 0972, substitute for S.B. No. 1681, An Act Concerning Prosecution of Traffic Violations on Grounds of the University of Connecticut, File No. 809.

Mr. Speaker, if there's no objection to any of these bills, I move now for the acceptance of the committees' report and passage.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

You heard the motion. Is there objection under Rule 48 on the part of any individual member to any of the items contained in the motion being considered on consent at this time? Hearing no objection, all those in favor will indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The bills are PASSED.

MR. MAHANEY (92nd):

Mr. Speaker, at this time, due to an objection, on page 3, I'd like to move that Calendar No. 0971, the third matter on the Calendar, substitute for S.B. No. 1421, File No. 806, be removed from the Consent Calendar.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER:

**S-79**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

**SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
1971**

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

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.

May 11, 1971

27

THE CHAIR:

Senator Jackson, did I understand that the way of us husbands getting some of the property back under appropriate circumstances.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Providing you get the divorce.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? If not all those in favor of passage signify by saying aye. AYE. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

Cal. 597, File 809 Favorable report of the Committee on Judiciary on S.B. 1681 An Act Concerning Prosecution of Traffic Violations on Grounds of the University of Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Jackson:

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, this would amend the existing law concerning presumption of evidence to incorporate any motor vehicle violation that occur on the grounds of the University of Connecticut. There is a very great difficulty in identifying the operator of these vehicles. And the intention of this bill would be to allow this presumption to apply at the University.

THE CHAIR:

Senator, do you move acceptance of it?

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**JUDICIARY**

**PART 2  
393-688**

**1971**

83  
BC  
THURSDAY

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

~~H.B. #6765~~ - AN ACT TO INCREASE THE DOLLAR EXEMPTION FOR GARNISHMENTS AND PROVIDE A MORE EQUITABLE GARNISHMENT PROCEDURE.

The first one is regarding raising the exemption of wage executions. I feel that at the present time that the exemption is well and satisfactory and if something like this is increased, it is going to take that much longer for us to collect on our wage executions.

H.B. #5866 - AN ACT CONCERNING DISSOLUTION OF GARNISHMENT.

Now the other bill #5866 - elimination of wage executions, I feel that in this, if it is eliminated, stores, banks or any other places who extend credit to individuals will then be forced to tighten up on their lending policies and deprive people - mainly in the lower income - of their wants - in other words to purchase things which they can only do on credit. Also I feel something like this - tightening up on credit could make an increase in prices on merchandise.

Sen Jackson: Thank you very much.

Mr. Wolf: There is one question I would like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, if this bill does go into effect, eliminating the wage executions, will that just effect at that time or ones presently in effect?

Sen. Jackson: Depends on how the bill is written but it would probably be if the Committee were to give favorable action in the General Assembly whether to pass it, it would be for those who it would effect in the future. Evelyn Gregan. Did Mr. Shannon speak from the State Department? Mr. Shannon Jerry Kiel. Donald W. Coste. Peter Litwin. Is there anyone here that wants to speak on a subject other than the Car Wash Bill #5713. Your name, Sir? Is there anyone else other than #5713. Mr. LaMare did you want to speak sir? then I believe the State Highway Department official has just come in so we want then to start on #5713,

Mr. Casale: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to speak on a couple of bills.

Sen Jackson: Can you speak into the mike please?

Mr. Casale: Pertaining to H.B. #1309 - concerning the support of children. I wish to state I am in favor of the proposed change in the statute. The legal and moral obligation and responsibilities of parents to support their minor children does not end with divorce.

Pertaining to #1311 - an act concerning when a State.....a spouse. I wish to state I am

84  
BC  
THURSDAY

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

FEBRUARY 25, 1971

Sen Jackson: You will have to speak louder, sir because you cannot be heard. So if you will raise the mike up just a bit.

Mr. Casale: I wish to state I am in favor of the proposed change in this statute when a state .....a spouse.

Pertaining to H.B. #1310 - an act concerning a court of an investigation in cases before the Family Relations Session I wish to state I am in favor of the proposed change in this statute. I believe it is unconstitutional to deny a concerned parent the right to read a report that is filled which will effect their children and their own future. I wish to voice my opposition to H.B. #6502.

H.B. #6502 - AN ACT CONCERNING THE DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE.

Mr four children and I are survivors of the Divorce Court of Connecticut. I am very displeased with the prevailing statutes concerning divorce which leave many changes in the statutes to be desired.

However, Mr. Chairman, this H.B. #6502 will be a step in the wrong direction for society's concern, for family stability in our state. Some of my reasons for opposing this bill are first, I do not like the involvment of attorneys in the court before any attempt has been made to help preserve the marriage by qualified, professional marriage counselors.

Second, I do not like the wide powers, an opportunity of attaching the estate of either party causing further aggravation to the existing situation. Greater legal costs and a possible loss of the estate through legal entanglement brought on by the attorneys involved.

Third, I do not like the involvment of a third attorney for the children causing still greater costs to the parties involved and close to the situation.

Fourth, I do not like the court giving consideration through the wishes of a child who may be under an emotional strain and can possibly be influenced by a parent who is also under an emotional strain.

Fifth, I do not like the right to intervene by any interested third party in which the court can award full custody, care education and visitation rights to.

Sixth, I do not like the wide powers of the court to award the State to either party. The wide powers of the court the use of the home pending light to either party without regard to the respect of interest of the parties.