

Act Number	Session	Bill Number	Total Number of Committee Pages	Total Number of House Pages	Total Number of Senate Pages
PA 71-78		546	2	1	1
<u>Committee Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judiciary 664-665 				<u>House Pages:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1357(Consent) 	<u>Senate Pages</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 925

H-110

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
1971**

**VOL. 14
PART 3
974-1450**

Tuesday, April 13, 1971 14.

come to order.

EFH

JOHN D. MAHANEY:

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Joint Rule No. 48, I would like, at this time, to move for the acceptance of the Joint Committees' favorable reports and passage of the following Bills that are on the Consent Calendar. On Page 1, Calendar No. 308, S.B. No. 0546, an Act concerning practice in Probate Court by partner or associate, File No. 178; Calendar No. 309, Substitute for S.B. No. 0547, an Act concerning a beneficiary's right to exoneration from a security interest existing at death, File No. 179; Calendar No. 310, S.B. No. 0578, an Act concerning the fire police, File No. 182; Calendar No. 0577, Substitute for S.B. No. 0762, an Act concerning confidentiality of communications and records of mental patients, File No. 153. If there is no objection to these Bills at this time, I move for their passage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does any individual Member object to the passage of the Bills on the Consent Calendar. Hearing no individual objection, the question is on acceptance and passage. Will all those in favor indicate by saying "aye". Those opposed. The Bills are passed.

JOHN D. MAHANEY:

Mr. Speaker, proceeding with Consent business at this time, pursuant to Joint Rule 48 of the House, I'd like to call the House's attention to the following Bills, which I move be placed on the Consent Calendar: on Page 5, Calendar No. 299, Substitute for H.B. No. 5256, an Act concerning welfare reimbursement, File

S-77

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1971

VOL. 14

PART 2

474-956

April 6, 1971

Page 112

on Judiciary. Senate Bill No. 546. An Act Concerning Practice in Probate Court by Partner or Associate.

SENATOR JACKSON:

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

THE CHAIR:

This bill provides that no partner or associate of a Judge of Probate, shall practice in his court. It also provides that no Judge of Probate shall appear in a contested matter in any probate court. It also retains section 45a of the General Statutes concerning disqualification of a Judge of Probate to act in any matter in which he is interested.

THE CHAIR:

Any further remarks? Question is on passage of the bill. Those in favor indicate by saying, "aye". Opposed? The ayes have it. Bill is passed.

THE CLERK:

CAL. NO. 161 FILE NO. 179, Favorable report of the joint standing committee on Judiciary. Substitute Senate Bill 547. An Act Concerning a Beneficiary's right to Exoneration from a Security Interest Existing at death.

SENATOR JACKSON:

Mr. President, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. This makes very clear that whenever any property has given, if there is a mortgage on it or other security interest that the property is given, subject to the mortgage or other security interest. At the present time, it is not clear that the executor or administrator of the estate have to pay off the mortgage or security interest before transferring title. I urge passage.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

JUDICIARY

**PART 2
393-688**

1971

And that is you also put the notice to the Commissioner, Welfare Commissioner on matter for the discretion of the Probate Court.

The privacy in some of these things is a very important thing when you are talking about blood relatives adopting and when you are talking about a father who is now acknowledging his paternity adopting and it seems to me that there is no useful purpose served in requiring the notice to the Welfare Commissioner.

There is one other comment and of course this is said with a great deal of misgiving because I read it quickly, but up at the top, it appears that the Court may enter a final decree approving the adoption very quickly. It then goes on and specifies a minimum time on an interlocutory decree. I am afraid that a Court might get some very difficult interpretations as to if you have a power to make it at any time, why you should have a minimum on the interlocutory part.

Sen. Rome: By way of helping this Committee in giving you some more time, could you provide a substitute Bill for this particular Bill so that we could consider it at the same time we consider that Bill, please.

Mr. Brennan: I would be delighted. Thank you.

Rep. Carrozzella: Judge Dworkin.

Mr. Dworkin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am Sidney Dworkin, Judge of Probate in the District of Bridgeport. In regard to Bill #6753, Judge Steiber set forth our joint position on it and I would urge your favorable consideration.

H.B. #6753 - AN ACT CONCERNING PAYMENTS BY JUDGES OF PROBATE TO THE STATE TREASURER.

I would also like to speak in regard to Bill #546.

S.B. #546 - AN ACT CONCERNING PROCTICE IN PROBATE COURT BY PARTNER OR ASSOCIATE.

I support this Bill and I urge its passage. I specially note Section 2 which prohibits or reads as follows: 'No Judge of Probate shall appear as attorney in any contested matter in any court of Probate.' And I urge particularly the adoption of that section. I have had experience and I found it quite un-nerving. I appreciate your listening to me.

Rep. Nevas: Representative Nevas, 144th District. Judge Dworkin, actually don't the cannons of judicial ethics now - I don't remember the cannon number but I have had occasion to look at them on this question. Don't the cannons now prevent a Judge or a member of his firm from practicing in the Probate Court?

Mr. Dworkin: The Cannon that you are referring to Formal.....Number 2, applies to Section 1 and 3 of the Bill and not, I believe Section #2 is an addition.

Rep. Nevas:I appreciate that but what I am saying is that Sections 1 and 3 are now covered by a cannon.

Mr. Dworkin: That is correct and that is why I emphasized Section No. 2. Thank you very much.

Rep. Carrozzella: Thank you very much. Francis E. Virgulak.

Mr. Virgulak: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, in the interest of time, many of my remarks that I had planned would be repetitive of what Chief Rush of West Hartford said so I would just like to cover maybe a couple of items to add, or perhaps which would be unique to the Fairfield County, I am speaking in favor of S. B. #787 and I am speaking as Chairman of the Southwest Region Criminal Justice Supervisory Board for the Fairfield County Chiefs of Police representing 17 communities.

S.B. #787 - AN ACT CONCERNING STATE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO REGIONAL CRIME OR NARCOTICS SQUADS.

The Regional Squad concept was first put into operation in Fairfield County - the first of its kind any place in the country, on the 5th of May, 1969 with only 10 men. I don't know if it would be in order to explain the Regional Concept, but this is where people in the region, the police departments put in one or two men to a squad that would be working at a common interest in this particular case, to identify and apprehend the sellers and dealers of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

The squad went into operation May 5th and by the end of 1969, they had arrested 288 dealers in Fairfield County and that was in something like 8 months of operation. It is interesting to note that for the year 1969, the entire year in the entire State of Connecticut, only 609 arrests for dealers have been made. So therefore, of the 609 in only 8 months of operation, the Regional Concept had accounted for 288.

In 1970, the Fairfield County Squad has accounted for 522 dealers in Fairfield County area. The Regional Concept was so successful, that it drew nationwide attention and the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs asked us to tour the country and visit 19 different cities throughout the United States just to explain to the various groups of Chiefs of Police, Sheriffs and Legislators how such a Squad is organized and operated. As a result, latest figures are that 58 such Squads have gone into operation throughout the country with a great deal of success.

This, in my more than 30 years of law enforcement, this is the first real coordinated concentrated effort I have seen on the part of law enforcement on all levels to tackle a common problem and a serious problem. This is part of the overall picture whereby the Federal Authorities are fighting the international and interstate traffic. Our involvement on the local levels and the regional levels makes more Federal Agents available for the International Operations. So it is really of the massive effort. Senator Rome asked Chief Rush whether he had an idea of his budget. I can tell you that in Fairfield County, our 1971 budget is \$117,837.10 is the projected figure at this point.

Sen. Rome: I was concerned not only with the budget but the breakdown of the