

SB 988

PA 772 FAX

1971

HOUSE	5900 (consent)	1
SENATE	2966 (consent)	1
General Law	566	1

3p.

H-120

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 13
5555-6226**

Wednesday, June 9, 1971

4

of the Parole Process, File No. 1650; Calendar No. 1629, substitute for S.B. No. 0821, An Act Concerning the Disclaimer of Property, File No. 1604; Calendar No. 1630, substitute for S.B. No. 0839, An Act Concerning the Escheat of Ownership Interests in Business Associations, File No. 1693; Mr. Speaker, in as much as this is the last consent calendar we'll have the privilege to bring before the House, I would now yield to Rep. Gilles from Middletown.

MR. GILLIES (75th):

Mr. Speaker, I move the following items be placed on consent, Calendar No. 1631, substitute for S.B. No. 0910, File No. 1590, An Act Concerning Rates Charged by Municipalities; Calendar No. 1632, substitute for S.B. No. 0988, An Act Concerning Persons Exempt from Registration as Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors, File No. 1054; Calendar No. 1633, substitute for S.B. No. 1017, An Act Concerning Full Disclosure of Property, Wages or Indebtedness on all Support Cases to the Circuit Court Family Relations Division, File No. 1605; Calendar No. 1636, substitute for S.B. No. 1187, An Act Concerning the Admissions, Dues and Cabaret Tax, File No. 1645; Calendar No. 1644, S.B. No. 1787, An Act Concerning Parole or Conditional Discharge of Persons to a Residential Community Center, File No. 1692; Calendar No. 1645, S.B. No. 1828, An Act Concerning Medical Internships, File No. 966; Calendar No. 1646, S.B. No. 1836, An Act Extending the Time for Filing Biennial Reports of the Norwalk Town Union of the King's Daughters and Sons, Incorporated, File No. 1714. I move that these items be passed on the consent calendar.

THE SPEAKER:

Is there objection to any of these items being adopted on the consent calendar? If not, the question is on acceptance and passage. All those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed? The bills indicated are PASSED.

S-82
CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1971

VOL. 14
PART 7
2874-3413

June 5, 1971

Page 5

SENATOR CALDWELL:

On page 1, Cal. 1134, 568; on page 5, C L. 1047; on page 6, Cal. 1067; on page 7, Cal. 1110, 1116; on page 8, Cal. 1131, 1133; on page 11, Cal. 1159 page 12, Cal. 1160, 1164, 1165, 1168, 1169; I might point out that that Calendar is currently marked Banks and should be the Liquor Committee; on page 13, Cal. 1170, 1171, 1179; page 14, Cal. 1182; on page 17, Cal. 1208; on page 23, Cal. 919, on page 26, Cal. 327; on page 28, Cal 491; on page 30 Cal. 664; on page 31, Cal. 733; on page 14, I omitted one, that we might take up, Mr. President, and that is Cal. 1181. SB1017, SB808, SB1187, SB1837, SB584, SB839, SB1787, SB592, SB890, SB337, SB1836, HB5190, SB1588, SB31, SB1828, SB988, SB1139

THE CHAIR: SB1836, HB5190, SB1588, SB31, SB1828, SB988, SB1139

Is there any objection to the motions recommended by the Majority Leader for suspension of the rules on any single starred or no starred items and for the passage of all bills, as described by him? If not, the motions are granted, said bills are declared passed.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Mr. President, I had a request from the Chairman of the General Law Committee, to remove one of those that I had placed on the Consent Motion, so I withdraw my motion with respect to that particular matter, it's on page 28, top of the page, Cal. No. 491.

THE CHAIR:

I don't think it's necessary to go through the proceeding of reconsideration. The motion is to withdraw the approval of that bill from the consnt list, if there is no objection. So ordered. That bill is not passed.

SENATOR CALDWELL:

Now, may we take up the following matters? On page 2, Cal. 665, recomit 765, take up 788; on page 3, take up Cal. 851, 858, 865, 925, and 929; on

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**GENERAL
LAW**

**PART 2
297-629**

1971

27
RSW
TUESDAY

GENERAL LAW

MARCH 16, 1971
1:00 P.M.

removed. The inference being that now these people can do architecture and do engineering design work, and we submit that that certainly wasn't the intent of the original law and there is no reason given for it today.

Rep. Webber: Is there someone here who proposes to speak in favor of Bill #990?

Mr. Kelly: Again, we will submit a written statement on that for the assistance of the Committee. Bill #753 introduced by Senator Cashman, and that is the bill you have already heard concerning licensing fire protection contractors. Without remarking on the merits of the bill, I just wish to note that the definition of a fire protection contractor in Section 1-a includes within authorized activity the "design" of fire protection systems. Of course this is not permitted under existing law and would be a violation of the provisions of Chapter 391, and we recommend that those words be omitted. Lastly, on S.B. 988 introduced by Senator Strada, AN ACT CONCERNING PERSONS EXEMPT FROM REGISTRATION UNDER CHAPTER 391, we have here, and I would ask permission to submit under separate cover, a proposed substitute for that bill introduced by Senator Strada, which would clarify the meaning of certain exemptions. I don't believe this will receive opposition, I've spoken with other parties that would have likely contrary interests, and there is no difficulty with it, and again I would submit a written statement on S.B. 988. Thank you very much.

Mr. Raymond C. Lyddy, Bridgeport: representing the State Medical Society and very briefly, may I direct my attention and your attention to two bills, #446 was spoken to just briefly before, that's the optician's bill and it was indicated that the State Medical Society would request an addition or an amendment to the bill, I have that here, may I just leave it with the Committee, indicating that hospital clinics would be exempted herefrom, and I noted Mr. Webber indicated or questioned about health care centers which probably might also be given consideration in that area too. I would also just briefly direct the Committee's attention to Bill #1446 which has been spoken to before and will be spoken to again. I understand that there is a radiologist here who will address his remarks to this bill as well. May I simply say that the position of the State Medical Society as regards this bill is that they too are opposed to additional licensing, to further fragmentation of the professional area. Certification fine. This is necessary and desirable, but licensing no. Mr. Tilson directed his remarks to that also. We agree that there should be a longer and harder look taken at this question of licensing, setting up additional boards, the chaos that really results. As far as the body of the bill, that again would be spoken to by someone else, but the Society merely wants to go on record as being opposed to any further licensing. We feel that in the para-medical